

U  
L  
P  
A

University of  
Leipzig  
Papers on  
Africa

HAWKINS IN GUINEA  
1567-1568

History and Culture  
Series  
No. 5 (2000)

Edited by P. E. H. Hair

INSTITUT FÜR  
AFRIKANISTIK



## HAWKINS IN GUINEA 1567-1568

Edited by P. E. H. Hair

Leipzig 2000  
ISBN 3-932632-65-6

---

### The series "History and Culture"

*is devoted principally to short scholarly editions of unpublished or little-known sources on African history.*

### For details of this and other ULPA series see

<http://www.uni-leipzig.de/afrikanistik/>

### This volume

*John Hawkins' three voyages to Guinea were anomalous in respect of the first eight decades of English commercial voyaging to Guinea (1550s-1630s), in that they were slaving voyages and hence proceeded to America. His third voyage of 1567-1569 was the most ambitious and, partly because it ended in disaster, the best recorded. This edition analyses the Guinea section of the voyage by drawing on English, Portuguese and Spanish sources. Two notable features are an attack on a Portuguese shipping base in River Cacheu, an episode concealed in the account published at the time, and the mercenary assistance lent to one side in an African civil war in Sierra Leone. The evidence for each Guinea episode, much of it previously unpublished, is presented with a commentary.*

**Key words:** *England, Portugal, Africa, Guinea, history, travel, voyages, slaves*

# **HAWKINS IN GUINEA 1567-1568**

**P.E.H. Hair**

# CONTENTS

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Sources</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>The Voyage: Evidence and Commentary</b>	
<b>1. From Plymouth to the Canary Islands</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2. At Teneriffe</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>3. Towards and at Cap Blanc</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>4. At Cape Verde</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>5. Past Cape Verde</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>6. Approaching Cape Roxo</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>7. In River Cacheu</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>8. At the Iles de Los and in rivers up to Sierra Leone</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>9. In the Sierra Leone estuary</b>	<b>62</b>
<b>Appendix: Records of the English captives</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>Index</b>	<b>85</b>

## INTRODUCTION

The third of the 1560s voyages to Guinea and Spanish America which John Hawkins led — the fourth of those he organised — attracted more attention at the time than had done the first and second voyages, because of its dramatic set back in Mexico and the international consequences. It has also been studied and written about by modern historians more extensively than its predecessor voyages, partly because of its fuller sources. However, compared with the plethora of writings on the trans-Atlantic aspect of the voyage, relatively little has appeared on its earlier stages, particularly the two and a half months spent in Guinea.<sup>1</sup> Part of Chapter VII in J.A. Williamson's *Sir John Hawkins*, published in 1927, remains the standard treatment.<sup>2</sup> Williamson has been criticised for his pro-Hawkins stance, but his account of the voyage was percipient and based on close study of the sources at that time available. Above all, Williamson recognised the importance of the fullest account of the voyage, covering events up to a few days before the disaster at San Juan de Ulúa, a manuscript account preserved, although damaged, in the Cotton collection of the British Museum (now British Library). Williamson published a transcript of this text, with many ingenious suggestions to complete passages where words or sentences had been lost — most of them patently correct but some to be accepted only with caution as being conjectural. In a second edition of 1949, Williamson made limited use of certain material from the Mexican and Spanish archives which had recently become more accessible, but shortened his Guinea narrative, regrettably. Possibly he had become aware that the geographical analysis of the course of the voyage in Guinea he had offered in 1927 was in part wrong.<sup>3</sup> The present edition has the advantage of Africanist knowledge unavailable eighty years ago but in general uses only Williamson's sources, albeit studied even more closely.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> As part of local historiography, Mexican historians developed an interest in Hawkins and his men. In 1869 the three accounts printed by Hakluyt (see the List of Printed Sources above) were translated into Spanish by the distinguished Mexican historian, Joaquín García Icazbalceta: *Obras*, 10 vols. (Mexico, 1896, reprinted New York, 1968), 7: 151–273; reprint of the translation of the Phillips account, *Boletín del Archivo General de la Nación*, 21 (1950, 257–300). And several later historians have discussed or documented the captives in Mexico, for instance, Vicente Riva Palacio, *México a través de los siglos*, 2 vols. (Barcelona, 1880), 2: 504–6; Pablo Martínez del Río, 'La aventura Mexicana de Sir John Hawkins', *Memorias de la Academia de la Historia*, 2/3 (1943), 241–95; *Corsarios Franceses e Ingleses en la Inquisición de la Nueva España siglo XVI*, introduction by Julio Jiménez Rueda (Mexico, 1945), 231–506 [seemingly the transcripts produced for G.R.G. Conway]. Meanwhile, a North American historian published documents from the Seville archives on the Caribbean and Mexican aspects of the voyage: I.A. Wright, ed., *Spanish documents concerning English voyages to the Caribbean 1527–1568* (Hakluyt Society, London, 1929), 114–62.

<sup>2</sup> James A. Williamson, *Sir John Hawkins. The Time and the Man* (Oxford, 1927); revised (and somewhat abbreviated) edition, *Hawkins of Plymouth. A new history of Sir John Hawkins and of other members of his family prominent in Tudor England* (London, 1949, 'second edition' [see P.E.H. Hair, *Mariner's Mirror*, 56 (1970), 442], 1969). For later, more critical comment on the Hawkins voyages, see K.R. Andrews, *The Spanish Caribbean. Trade and Plunder 1530–1630* (New Haven, 1978), chapter V, 'Hawkins and Slaving', which includes brief references to the 1567–1569 voyage (i.e., 1567–1568 in Guinea, 1568–1569 in America).

<sup>3</sup> Note that Guinea toponyms appear in the sources in sixteenth-century Portuguese, Spanish, Latin and English versions, but in this edition are given in the presently received English or French forms (e.g. 'Cape Verde', 'Sierra Leone', 'Iles de Los'), or in a hybrid form (e.g. 'River São Domingos', 'River Dubréka'), except in the extracts from the evidence of the English captives when the original form may be retained (e.g. 'Santo Domingo').

<sup>4</sup> The present edition is the first part of a project, visualised as a comprehensive edition of sixteenth-century English voyages to Guinea when offered to and taken aboard by the Hakluyt Society some years ago. I am indebted to the Society for its tolerance as the promised time-scale for completion was drawn out, and when,

### Sources

The sources analysed in this edition are, first, three contemporary and personal accounts of the whole voyage which are known only in print, the manuscript originals having disappeared. What is termed here the 'public account' appeared as a pamphlet in 1569, in the year of the return of the surviving vessels. Being written in the first person, it was presumably written by Hawkins himself or at least under his immediate direction. It concentrates on the American episodes and represents an indignant, if somewhat forced protest against alleged Spanish treachery. It was reprinted in Hakluyt's first and second editions with hardly any significant changes from the original text in its Guinea section — which is a mere handful of sentences within two paragraphs.<sup>5</sup> Hakluyt's two editions added two longer accounts of the voyage as far as San Juan de Ulúa, both by Englishmen who had been captured in Mexico and served long sentences of supervised labour either there or in Spain before escaping and returning to England. The first edition printed an account by Miles Phillips, who reached England in February 1582 (or 1582/3). The exact circumstances in which this account was produced and how it reached Hakluyt do not appear to be known and its contents have to date received little or no critical analysis, but since as regards Guinea it tends to echo the public account (at some points suspiciously) and says little more, it only needs to be pointed out that Phillips was a boy of apparently thirteen to fourteen during the Guinea period of the voyage and so may have learned little.<sup>6</sup>

The third account appeared as a pamphlet in 1591 and was therefore reprinted only in Hakluyt's second edition. Job Hortop, a gunner, perhaps illiterate,<sup>7</sup> told his rambling story of

---

given my age, it seemed judicious that the first completed part should appear as a separate publication. I am equally indebted to Professor Adam Jones for accepting it into the University of Leipzig/Institut für Afrikanistik series.

<sup>5</sup> For the Hakluyt editions, hereafter cited as Hakluyt 1589 and 1595, see the List of Printed Sources below. Despite the change of title each time, and apart from many spelling changes and additional punctuation, the 1589 Hakluyt version only differs in its Guinea section from the 1569 pamphlet text in half a dozen verbal changes which generally do not affect the meaning. The second Hakluyt edition repeats the text of the first, with only further spelling changes.

<sup>6</sup> The evidence Phillips gave before the Inquisition in Mexico in 1572–1574 is in print, but relates mainly to 'heretical' religious practices in England and aboard ship, with very little detail on the course of the voyage ('Proceso contra Miles Phillips' [seemingly the transcript produced for G.R.G. Conway, introduced by Julio Jiménez Rueda], *Boletín del Archivo General de la Nación*, 20 (1949), 255–300, 469–663; 21 (1950), 117–66). Phillips was considered to be eighteen in 1572, although at one point he said that he was fifteen when recruited in 1567 (628); all the captives who mentioned him referred to him when on the voyage as a *muchacho* 'boy'. He was a page to Hawkins and he claimed that he mixed only with other pages (631), although in his account he noted that he was acquainted with the musicians, who no doubt played mainly to the company of the upper deck (Hakluyt 1589, 572). After he returned to England he was in contact with several survivors: he knew that Goddard was 'still alive' at the time of writing and living in Plymouth; he knew of 'one Copstowe, and certain others yet alive' who had been tortured at San Juan de Ulúa (and who had presumably been in the group of captives released in Spain in 1570); and he noted that Ingram 'hath often told me' and that the names of Ingram's lost companions 'we could not remember' (ibid., 566–8). While he could not have discussed circumstances in Mexico after Ingram's party separated from Phillips' party, he could have discussed with him earlier events. Ingram's two companions were dead before Phillips returned, but Ingram wrote his account at least five years after returning, and possibly much later (if a reference to 'yong M. Winter' at Magellan Strait, that is, an event of 1578, was not inserted editorially) (ibid., 561, 643E). It is therefore possible that Phillips and Ingram prepared their accounts at about the same time. For certain errors in Phillips' account, see Jiménez Rueda, *Corsarios*, xxi, note 11).

<sup>7</sup> According to interrogations in Mexico, three fellow-gunners of Hortop were illiterate (Thomas Stephens, John Borches, Christopher Robinson).

the voyage, his subsequent detention in Mexico and his final escape to England, in two 1591 versions, the second, revised and enlarged version correcting some, but not all, of the mistakes in the Guinea section of the first version. Significant changes between the two versions in their Guinea sections are indicated below. The account has not to date received overall critical analysis.<sup>8</sup> Whoever actually composed the narrative does not seem to have read the public account (which twenty years after its publication may not have been easily available), and it is not obvious that Hortop and the assumed ghost-editor of the enlarged version consulted any other survivor of the voyage, making this account an independent one. Despite its slips, it is more informative about the Guinea episodes, at least as these were comprehended on the lower deck, than the two previous printed sources.

The other sources are extant manuscripts. The Cotton manuscript has been mentioned above. Its author was a very well-informed individual who may or may not have returned to England with Hawkins and his manuscript, if not a trader or a leading ship's officer, then one of the gentlemen adventurers close to Hawkins.<sup>9</sup> It provides a lengthy and detailed account of the

---

<sup>8</sup> The *Short Title Catalogue*, however, notes that although 'both are first-hand narratives one (probably 13828 [the second]) is extensively edited by an unknown hand'. Conceivably some of the additional chunks of natural history were inserted by an 'editor', although many similar chunks appear in the first version, and all show a certain amount of personal observation, suggesting that, if indeed the additional ones did not come from Hortop, the unknown editor had either been in Guinea (and America) himself or had drawn on some third party who had. Hortop's account can be faulted for inaccuracy only at a few points, and it therefore differs from a third account by another survivor. The account attributed to David Ingram which appeared in the first Hakluyt edition — but was significantly dropped from the second — has baffled scholars to date, for although there is no doubt that Ingram and two companions returned to England in 1569 in a French ship which had picked them up in North America, Ingram's account of his overland travels in North America bears little or no resemblance to actuality and appears to be almost wholly fictional. It is unclear whether Ingram composed it himself or whether the inventive material was the work of another individual, and equally unclear why the account was ever produced. Although Hortop and Phillips served on the same ship, the *Jesus*, and were members of the same party of eighty survivors, in their accounts neither mentions the other. The record of Phillips' examination by the Inquisition has survived, but no record relating to Hortop's interrogations in Mexico and Spain appears to be extant. I cannot find the name 'Job' in the list of prisoners taken at Tampico (photograph of the page, Rumeu de Armas, *Viajes*, opp. 320), and perhaps he gave a different or false name. However, a document listing prisoners in Mexico City in 1570 includes a 'Job', the only occurrence of this name and no doubt representing Hortop. Moreover, in the course of the Inquisition interrogation of Collins he referred thrice 'Job', and at one point identified him as a gunner on the flag-ship, last seen in Mexico three years earlier, i.e. in 1569 — Collins ignored or was unaware of Hortop's transfer to Spain in 1570. Job, described as 'tall, slim, ruddy, with a small beard' and then aged 20, had worked as a powder-maker (his occupation in England) and had made fire-works for the friars (Jiménez Rueda, *Corsarios*, 407, 445, 495) — for an incident involving fire-works aboard the ship carrying Hortop to Spain, see Hakluyt 1598, 3: 493). And since the record of the Inquisition trial of Phillips includes one passing reference to a 'Job' ('Proceso', 500), perhaps Phillips had some acquaintance with Hortop in Mexico.

<sup>9</sup> Williamson suggests that the writer was Valentine Green, who was captured in Mexico, the account breaking off at the point where the English were about to be attacked and Green with others captured. Green gave evidence in Mexico and certain details he supplied resemble those in the Cotton MS account. He was a trader (although in one record described as a servant on the *Jesus* — perhaps a deliberate deceit). If instead the writer was one of the gentlemen adventurers, a likely candidate is George Fitzwilliam, who had sailed on the previous Hawkins voyage and was probably the leading gentleman; he too was captured at San Juan de Ulúa. Like the account of the previous voyage by John Sparke, twenty year later published by Hakluyt, the Cotton MS account is not a daily log but a continuous narrative, seeming to have been composed in one piece, as far as it goes. For what purpose were these narratives composed? Presumably they were not intended for publication at the time, but may have been reports for the promoters. Sparke's narrative was probably composed after the voyage concluded, and it is conceivable that, similarly, the Cotton MS account was not composed en route, but later, from notes. In this case, its incompleteness would be due to the final part describing the disaster in Mexico and thereafter having been removed. This possibility

Guinea episodes, with the defect that important issues often are predicted but cannot be clarified because of the serious damage done to the manuscript when it was burned around the edges, and particularly on the upper edge, in an eighteenth-century fire. The Williamson transcript, available since 1927 in print, does not seem to have been subsequently checked against the manuscript, but the transcription appears to have been carefully done, and is here followed.

The second manuscript source is also in a British archive. In 1569 a Portuguese envoy handed over to the English government a lengthy document, in Latin, complaining about alleged depredations on Portuguese property in Guinea committed during the various Hawkins voyages. The document, sometimes called a 'book of complaints', contains evidence collected from Portuguese individuals who had been in Guinea and who had been witnesses or had heard about the alleged depredations. The importance of this evidence lies in it representing a viewpoint very different from that of the English sources. It is extensively cited in this edition, in my English translation of the Latin. (It should be remembered, however, that we lack any source representing the viewpoint of the third party in Hawkins' activities, the Africans of Guinea.)

The third manuscript source is also presented in translation. Between 1569 and 1574 a large number of individuals on the studied voyage, having been captured in Mexico, were interrogated by the Spanish authorities, both the secular authorities and the ecclesiastical Holy Office or Inquisition, and, in certain instances, both at first in Mexico and later in Spain. The responses of the English captives were carefully recorded and assembled, and this evidence is partly extant, in Mexican and Spanish archives. A little of it relates to the Guinea section of the voyage, the secular and church authorities having been respectively searching, in the main, for evidence of English violence against Portuguese interests, or for evidence of heretical or anti-Catholic practices during that period of the voyage.<sup>10</sup> In the 1920s, all records relating to sixteenth-century Englishmen in Mexico still to be found in Mexican and Spanish archives (and in examinable condition) were transcribed, and translated from the Spanish, by and for G.R.G. Conway, a British engineer resident in Mexico City. Sets of up to eighty volumes of this massive Conway material were eventually presented to three international libraries, and the present edition has used the set in Cambridge University Library.<sup>11</sup> The

---

would not totally rule out Green or Fitzwilliam as the writer, since the latter certainly, and the former probably, returned eventually to England. However, these speculations about the mode of composition can only be assessed when the whole document has been expertly and critically analysed. It should be added that 'Green' appears in the Spanish records as 'Ber', which Williamson supposes to stand for 'Verde', a translation of 'Green'; but perhaps his name was not that, but 'Bird' or 'Bear' or 'Beer' or even 'Baird'. Another English captive passed as 'Juan Ber'.

<sup>10</sup> The Inquisition records are particularly detailed and voluminous; furthermore they are complex since evidence from trials of certain of the English whose files have not survived can appear within the evidence presented against other Englishmen whose files have survived. Much of the interrogation related to religious practices in contemporary England (and Wales). The milder traditional episcopal Inquisition in Mexico was replaced in 1572 by a branch of the 'Tribunal of the Holy Office', the renowned 'Spanish Inquisition', a more determined institution, whose first activities in Mexico were directed against foreigners suspected of heresy. See, in general, Richard E Greenleaf, *The Mexican Inquisition of the Sixteenth Century* (Albuquerque, 1969), which briefly discusses the trials of the English (pp.162–7), the details not always accurate; see also Joaquín Pérez Villanueva and Bartolomé Escandell Bonet, eds., *Historia de la Inquisición en España y América*, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1984), contribution by A. Huerga, 937–50, which refers to the 'super-zealous trials' (*procesos acuciosimos*) of the English.

<sup>11</sup> See J. Street, 'The G.R.G. Conway Collection in Cambridge University Library: a checklist', *Hispanic American*



English translations are cited extensively below — I have not consistently checked the translations against the Spanish transcripts.

The range of available sources not only presents a fuller picture of Hawkins' activities but helps, by setting one source against another, to identify some of the biases in each. Whereas the English sources tend to justify the activities, the printed sources often merely by silence, the Cotton manuscript by narrative details and argument, the Portuguese source dismisses the English as barbarian, plundering pirates, always in the wrong. The English captives respond to Spanish interrogation in a number of ways, sometimes by silence and concealment, sometimes by denial, sometimes by devious statements or downright lies, sometimes by answers patently tailored to mollify their interrogators by telling them what they wanted to hear. But English captives did not always grasp the point of Spanish interrogation since ideas of right- and wrong-doing are not universals, or for that matter constant over time. Similarly, the English and the Portuguese did not agree on contemporary notions of international law, while the reader must recollect that none of the parties involved, Spanish, Portuguese, English or African, shared the latterday notion that slaving is morally indefensible, let alone the presentday notion that an extreme of wrong-doing is represented by the involvement of Christian Europe in African slave practices and hence the Atlantic slave trade.

Because we depend on records that are always incomplete, history never tells the whole story. The truth indeed 'lies out there' — inaccessible. Hence there are issues in the story of the 1567/1568 voyage which cannot now be resolved. Nevertheless, close analysis of the evidence at least allows us keyhole glimpses of what went on, and certainly enables us to challenge, modify or deny some of the general statements about the voyage previously current. In general, we enlarge on rather than alter Williamson's description of the voyage. The history is somewhat intricate, and the present study should therefore be regarded as interim and open to further scholarly critique, from myself and others.

### **The historical context of the voyage**

For the mid sixteenth-century English, the Atlantic posed a challenge, in the form of confrontation with the monopolies of commerce to the South and West claimed and defended, militarily as well as diplomatically and spiritually, by Portugal and Spain. The English first challenged Portugal. In 1555, Richard Eden, while being tactful about Spain's American monopoly, given that the Prince of Spain was currently the consort of the Queen of England, complained bitterly about the Portuguese Guinea monopoly.<sup>12</sup> In the 1550s English gold traders went to Guinea but eventually met fierce and successful Portuguese resistance.

---

*Historical Review* 37 (1957), 60–81, which notes the published checklists for the other two libraries. It must be said that, faced with such a mountain of unindexed material, the researcher into the Guinea aspects of the voyage pursues a task not dissimilar to the proverbial hunt for a needle in a haystack, and it follows that some relevant information may well have been overlooked.

<sup>12</sup> Richard Eden, *The Decades of the newe worlde or West India* (London, 1555), f. 343–343v ('thambition of such as ... by ... the erectynge of certeyne forteresses or rather blockhouses among naked people, thinke themselves woorthy to bee lordes of halfe the worlde ...', in 'The description of the two viages made owt of England into Guinea ...'). It has been claimed, somewhat misleadingly, that 'despite the apparently pro-Spanish content of Eden's dedication and preface, it seems likely that his purpose was to goad Englishmen into competing with the Spaniards in the New World' (Richard Helgerson, *Forms of Nationhood. The Elizabethan Writing of England* (Chicago, 1992), 331, note 51). It is true that in an earlier work, written under the Protestant predecessor of Queen Mary, Eden had called for greater English interest in America. In the 1555 work, however, Eden was indeed goading Englishmen, but into competing with the Portuguese, in Africa.

Perhaps it was this Portuguese hostility which encouraged Hawkins to take a revolutionary new line in English commerce, by acting aggressively towards Portugal in Guinea, and in time, by extension, towards Spain in America. His three slaving voyages to Guinea were unprecedented — and after the last voyage ended in disaster, the English did not attempt slaving for another seventy years. But the irruptions into Spanish America were as unprecedented as the Guinea aggression. Each novelty depended on the other, for without slaves it was pointless trying to trade to any extent in the Caribbean, while without trade in the Caribbean it was pointless to gather up slaves in Guinea.<sup>13</sup>

The first two Hawkins voyages were almost successful. In America this was because the Spanish empire was far from monolithic, and the interests of backwoods Caribbean settler communities were not in line with the priorities announced in Madrid and then filtered down as orders to its varying lax colonial officials. Hawkins traded slaves and bribed the settlers and local officials, who then told fibs to the metropolitan authorities, claiming to have been victims of force majeure. (Another grudging fringe territory of imperial Spain was the Canary Islands, and Hawkins' friends there may well have encouraged and persuaded him to challenge the metropolitan slaving monopolies.) Perhaps Hawkins believed that Portuguese communities in Guinea were similarly grudging of the metropolitan priorities which constricted their economic advancement, and that they were therefore willing to defy Lisbon and trade with foreign heretics — and to a limited extent he was right. Both Hawkins and the local Portuguese thus wobbled between opportunist co-existence and violent confrontation. However the sources admit no such tergiversation. The English sources claim that peaceful trade was always offered, at least first; the Portuguese sources claim that violence was the order of the day from the start. Each side had reasons for being less than truthful. The English for long concealed the violent episodes in River Cacheu which were contrary to current international law and, worse still, to Elizabeth's deliberately pussyfooting diplomacy.<sup>14</sup> The Portuguese traders in Guinea, who had for long broken Lisbon laws by trading with foreigners and heretics when it suited them, laid into English violence to cover up any peaceful commercial negotiations which might call down on them the punishments of the state and church authorities.

Yet both sides had history behind them when violent. The official Portuguese claim to a lordship of Guinea that precluded trade there by non-Portuguese was a shade musty by the 1560s; nevertheless the English attempt to start up trade to eastern Guinea in the 1550s had been met by Portuguese naval action, a continuation of an earlier campaign against French 'pirates'. In 1558 an Anglo-Portuguese naval battle took place near Mina. The Portuguese

---

<sup>13</sup> While there existed Englishmen who traded with Spanish America, normally from a base in Spain or the Canaries, and one or two Englishmen resident in America as agents, this trade was limited, and from the 1550s was threatened and constrained by the campaign against heretics which began in support of the reign of Philip and Mary in England and developed when these Catholic monarchs were succeeded by the 'Lutherite' Elizabeth. A striking instance was the trial and condemnation, by the episcopal inquisition in Mexico, of Robert Tomson in 1559–1560, as documented at length in G.R.G. Conway, *An Englishman and the Mexican Inquisition 1556-1560* (Mexico City, 1927). Williamson was justified in stressing the 'Protestant' content of the Hawkins voyages, a feature of the voyages under-played by later liberal historians eager to stress, instead, their economic motivation.

<sup>14</sup> Elizabeth was claiming that the English had the right to go to parts of Guinea where the Portuguese had no — in modern parlance — effective occupation. There was room for argument whether this extended to Sierra Leone (and this may be why the Portuguese evidence made some play with the few Portuguese resident there), but indisputably River Cacheu was a Portuguese base, in fact their main base in western Guinea.

stiffened their defences and in 1565 sunk a ship belonging to the Winter brothers, business associates of Hawkins and later his naval colleagues. Whereas Hawkins went to America claiming to have been a friend of the former king of England, Philip of Spain, and hence blissfully unhostile to Spanish interests, he could not claim the same in relation to Portugal in Guinea. From the start Hawkins was happy to take revenge on Portugal, by aggressive action at the drop of a hat. His account of the 1562–1563 voyage (albeit written many years later) spoke joyfully of collecting slaves 'by the sword'. Usually understood as referring to raiding African settlements, which he certainly did not hesitate to do, the phrase was more probably intended to refer to seizures from the Portuguese. According to Portuguese sources — although they may well have exaggerated — he obtained most of his slaves on his first two voyages by threatening Portuguese with the sword, if not often going so far as to plunge the weapon into recalcitrant individuals.

The extraordinary game of bluff and counter-bluff practised between Hawkins and the Spanish crown in the 1560s and 1570s, not least in relation to the 1560s voyages and their aftermath, makes any sort of sense only when set within the diplomatic maze of the period, which involved an ideological war across western Europe between Reformation and Counter-Reformation, major dynasties with unsettled successions, including an unmarried queen in England, civil war in France, and imperial disorder in the Netherlands. To a certain extent Hawkins practised his deceiving manoeuvres on the Portuguese in Guinea before attempting them on the Spaniards in America, notably by obtaining from cooperating, or perhaps threatened, Portuguese traders certificates of voluntary sale. But there was one difference. Whereas serious English interest in Spanish America was unprecedented, English interest in Portuguese Guinea began, not with Hawkins and slaves, but with the gold voyages of the 1550s. The connection between the gold voyages and the slaving voyages needs more detailed consideration than can be given here, since it can reasonably be both claimed and denied. On the one hand, some of Hawkins' promoters had been gold voyage promoters, and there was the motive of revenge noted above. Nevertheless, there is a strong case for seeing the Hawkins voyages as innovatory; their aggressive and predatory features as deriving more from Hawkins' personality than from the past and current historical circumstances. Hawkins took Englishmen to Guinea to act as soldiers, for the first time, and used them on land against Portuguese and Africans.<sup>15</sup> Yet there had to be limits to his self-expression, not least because of the need to justify his actions on his return home. The evidence presented to the Spanish interrogators by the English captives, about his ploys to demonstrate that he was acting

---

<sup>15</sup> Early Elizabethan England having no standing army, there were few regular, full-time, professional 'soldiers'. Able-bodied men were expected to have the capacity to become soldiers when so required, and it was supposed that many had already had some appropriate skill (e.g. in archery). Although some of the captives described themselves to the Spaniards as 'soldiers', others said they fought 'as soldiers' (and hence can be credited with two different occupations). Whether Hawkins engaged any men specifically and solely as soldiers is unclear, particularly since some recruits were 'prest' into service, but possibly a small number had gained military experience, for instance in the French wars. The 1550s gold voyages had concluded with an Anglo-Portuguese naval battle, but on land the English had generally avoided contact with the Portuguese and had on the whole traded peacefully with Africans, with no more than one or two minor alarms and affrays (A. Teixeira da Mota and P.E.H. Hair, *East of Mina: Afro-European Relations on the Gold Coast in the 1550s and 1560s*, Madison, 1988). On Hawkins' earlier voyages, the relatively small numbers of Englishmen aboard the ships (100 and 170, compared with about 410 in 1567) suggests that the slave-raiding attacks on African communities which occurred were less 'soldierly' than the attacks in 1567 and 1568 which involved parties of one hundred and more Englishmen. I am indebted to Professor D.B. Quinn for alerting me to the social significance of 'soldiers' in early Elizabethan society.

legally and even morally (for instance, by denying abandoned vessels at Cap Blanc to an Islamic power), may not have been entirely fiction.<sup>16</sup>

Finally, the aspect of the Hawkins voyages which latterly has attracted most attention has been their slaving and above all their slave-raiding. The raiding was in actuality irresponsible, naïve and unknowledgable, and economically of trivial gain. A century and more of slave trading in Guinea had generated a modestly normal system of commerce involving on the one hand African potentates, traders and traditional social institutions, and on the other European shippers. In fairness, Hawkins made some attempt to relate to this system and buy slaves, and it may be that the accounts over-emphasise, as is the way of the world, the more dramatic events, including in this case the episodes of slave raiding. Be that as it may, on the widest view, in terms of world history, the significance of the Hawkins slaving in the 1560s is its singularity. Between the 1440s and the 1640s, the only English intervention in the developing export slave trade from western Africa was in the 1560s. It can even be argued that, whatever the reasons that kept the English out of the trade before the 1560s, the disaster in Mexico on the Hawkins voyage of 1567–1569 played a major role in inhibiting further intervention for about seventy years.

Hawkins collected near 500 slaves in Guinea. Before the 1560s, the English, unlike the Portuguese, Spanish and French, had had no experience of the problems involved in conveying slaves. Hawkins must have gained some experience on his earlier voyages but had probably never carried as many slaves as he did in 1567–1568.<sup>17</sup> It is doubtful whether his ships were in any way adapted to the task. Allowing that the conditions for slaves on all transAtlantic slave voyages were, to say the least, hard and harsh; and even allowing for the possibility that some of Hawkins' slaves may have weighed the traumatic uprooting and unimaginably strange and threatening circumstances in which they now found themselves, against the immediate violent death they most likely had expected in Africa, the conditions aboard the Hawkins vessels may well have been particularly 'inhumane'.<sup>18</sup>

### **The 1567-1568 voyage to Guinea**

Hawkins had made two previous voyages to Guinea and America, the first in 1562-1563, the second in 1564-1565. The scale of the ventures had increased, the first voyage employing some 100 men, the second 170, the third about 410. The first voyage is poorly recorded, as also is the voyage to America in 1566-1567 by Hawkins' stand-in, John Lovell, which may or may not have touched the mainland of Guinea. Hawkins' second voyage was recorded in the account written by John Sparke at the time and eventually published by Hakluyt in 1589, and this account provides detail on the Guinea section of the voyage, including valuable

---

<sup>16</sup> For other instances, see P.E.H. Hair, 'Protestants as pirates, slavers and proto-missionaries: Sierra Leone 1568 and 1582', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 21 (1970), 207-8.

<sup>17</sup> Williamson suggests some 400 slaves on the first two voyages, against the near 500 on the third voyage (*Hawkins*, 84, 104). Yet the 400 had been carried on fewer ships, which may explain why Hawkins seems to have thought that he could have carried more of the Africans taken in the capture of the town at Sierra Leone.

<sup>18</sup> Williamson argues that two Caribbean ports took 360 slaves, leaving 60 still aboard the English vessels, hence with the unknown number sold at a third port, 'the casualties must have been few' (*Hawkins*, 178, note 1). The conclusion is implausible. From Sierra Leone to the first Caribbean port took 52 days, and parties of slaves were unloaded over a period of a further four months. Given the near 500 slaves leaving Sierra Leone, the number of those dying in the Middle Passage alone is likely to have been over fifty, rather than the handful implied by Williamson's calculation. It looks as if either the evidence cited exaggerated the numbers sold and remaining, or else the estimate of those carried is too low.

ethnographic information. The 1567-1568 voyage presumably made use of the recollected experience of Hawkins and those of his officers who had served on either or both of the previous voyages, and of their notes and perhaps Sparke's manuscript account.<sup>19</sup> It is conceivable that one or two of the officers may have sailed on the 1550s gold voyages, and also that Hawkins made use of the accounts of those voyages, mostly still in manuscript but two in print.<sup>20</sup> However, the 1550s accounts concentrated on two localities never visited by Hawkins, the Malagueta Coast (modern Liberia) and the Mina Coast (later Gold Coast, now Ghana). Certainly, unlike the 1550s voyages, the Hawkins voyages do not appear to have used Portuguese pilots.<sup>21</sup>

We may assume that Hawkins and his backers always intended that his third voyage should follow the pattern of the first two and thus slave in Guinea. Notionally, however, the operation was set in motion by the arrival in England of two renegade Portuguese who offered to conduct the English to rich gold mines beyond Mina.<sup>22</sup> This offered a return to the gold-seeking voyages of the previous decade and thus had the propaganda advantage that the English could argue that it was less internationally confrontational than a slaving voyage, because it could be claimed that it did not challenge the locality in Guinea where the Portuguese patently had effective occupation, the castle at Mina, and, more convincingly, it would not challenge Spain because a gold voyage would return to England, not proceed to America. In the event, the two Portuguese fled England before Hawkins sailed, and although Hawkins during the voyage occasionally pretended to toy with the idea of going further east in Guinea for gold, this was always incompatible with the slaving he was already undertaking.

In October 1567 Hawkins sailed from Plymouth with a large flagship and five smaller vessels, and a total force of some 410 men and boys. After escaping from a storm, the fleet reached the **Canary Islands**, where the English engaged with friendly local traders and suspicious Spanish officials. The next halt was near **Cap Blanc**, on the Saharan coast, where for a few days in late October the English had an ambivalent encounter with a few Portuguese fishermen and gained an additional vessel. In mid November, having reached Guinea, at **Cape Verde** a slave raid was attempted, with disappointing and unhappy results. A little further on, off the coast of Senegal, a small fleet of French traders was searched, and two more vessels joined the English fleet, but Hawkins made no attempt to trade in that locality. Some 150 miles further south, while the larger ships lay off **Cape Roxo**, in the last days of 1567 some smaller vessels entered nearby **River Cacheu**, an important Portuguese commercial and administrative base. Whatever the original intentions of the visit, it eventuated in the capture and plundering of many Portuguese vessels, and an attack on an African town, presumably for the purposes of slave gathering, which ended in English retreat and loss. Sailing 250 miles SSE, the fleet briefly watered at the **Iles de Los**, while small craft entered nearby rivers, to find and obtain slaves from Portuguese vessels trading there. In January 1568, the main fleet lay in the **Sierra Leone** estuary, 60 miles further SSE, where contacts were again made with Portuguese traders, but Hawkins worried about the inadequate number of slaves so far obtained. Relief came with an invitation to the English to participate,

---

<sup>19</sup> Thomas Hampton, now master of the *Minion*, had served on both earlier Hawkins voyages.

<sup>20</sup> Eden, *Decades*, ff.343-60.

<sup>21</sup> But Spanish pilots were used for the American section of the voyages.

<sup>22</sup> See Williamson, *Hawkins*, p.127 ff.

as mercenaries, in a local civil war. In alliance with one African army, and after a fierce battle, a town held by another African army was captured, and many slaves obtained. In early February, with some 500 slaves, and by now some 300 Englishmen (and a few African interpreters), the fleet began its Atlantic crossing. It traded in the Caribbean but on September 1568 at **San Juan de Ulúa** was overwhelmed by Spanish arms. Hawkins escaped and returned to England, reaching there in January 1569; on his ship and two following vessels were probably not more than 100 other survivors.

## LIST OF PRIMARY PRINTED SOURCES

[**John Hawkins**], *A true / declaration of the / troublesome voy- / adge of M. John Hau / kins to the parties of / Guynea and the west / Indies, in the yea- / res of our Lord 1567, and / 1568. / Imprinted at / Londõ in Poules Church-/ yarde, by Thomas Purfoo / te for Lucas Harrison, / dwelling at the sig / ne of the Crane. / Anno. 1569.* [London] unpag. [28pp]; STC 12961; UMU microfilm reel 385.

The mixture of typefaces on the original title page, largely in roman but with occasional italic, is not represented above, or in the titles below. The narrative begins 'Here followeth a note or declaration of the troublesome voyage, made with the Jesus, the Mynion, and foure other shippes to the parties of Guynea & the Weste Indies in the years 1567 and 1568 by John Haukins'. Reprinted as 'The 3. unfortunate voyage made with the Iesus, the Minion, and foure other shippes, to the partes of Guinea, and the West Indias, on the yeere 1567 and 1568, by M. John Hawkins', in Hakluyt 1589 [see below in this list], 553–7; reprinted as 'The third troublesome voyage of the right worshipfull sir John Hawkins ...', in Hakluyt 1598 [see below in this list], 3: 521–5. The 1589 text in its Guinea section differs from the 1569 original in many spelling changes, frequent introduction of commas, and very occasional verbal changes, only the last noted in the present edition. Also reprinted, edited, in Edward Arber, ed., *An English Garner*, (7 vols, Birmingham), 5 (1882): 203–48, 331–4.

**Miles Phillips**, 'A discourse written by one Miles Phillips Englishman, one of the company put a shore in the West Indies by M. John Hawkins in the yeere 1568, contayning many speciall things of that countrie and of the Spanish governement, but specially of their cruelties used to our Englishmen, and amongst the rest to himselfe for the space of 15. or 16. yeeres together, untill by good and happy meanes he was delivered from their bloody hands and returned to his owne countrie, Anno, 1582', in Hakluyt 1589, 562–80.

Reprinted in Hakluyt 1598, 3: 469–87, with only spelling changes, as 'The voyage of Miles Phillips, ... a little to the North of Panuco, from whence he travelled to Mexico ...'.

[**Job Hortop**], *The Rare / Trauailes of Iob Hortop, an Englishman, / who was not heard of in three and / twentie yeeres space. / Wherin is declared the dangers he esca- / ped in his voiage to Gynnies, where after hee was / set on shoare in a wildernes neere to Panico, / hee endured much slauerie and / bondage in the Spanish / Galley. / Wherein he also discouereth many strange and wonder / full things seene in the time of his trauaile, as well concer / ning wilde and sauage people, as also of sundrie / monstrous beasts, fishes, and foules, and / also Trees of wonderfull forme / and qualitie. / London. / Printed for William Wright. 1591.* unpag. [19pp]; STC 13827.5

Facsimile reprints; (Boston, 1925); privately printed, introduction by G.R.G. Conway (Mexico, 1928).

I.H. [= **Job Hortop**], *The Trauailes of an Englishman. / Containing his syndrie ca/ lamities indured by the space of twentie and odd yeres / in his absence from his natieue Countrie; wherein is / truly deciphered the sundrie shape of wilde / Beasts, Birds, Fishes, Foules, rootes, / plantes, &c. / With the description of a man that appeared in the Sea; and / also of a huge Giant brought from China to the / King of Spaine. / No less pleasant than approved. / By I.H. / Published with authoritie. / Imprinted at London for William Wright, and are to be / solde at his shop neere vnto Pauls / Schoole, 1591.*

31pp; STC 13828; UMU microfilm, reel 1603

Revised and enlarged version of the previous item. Facsimile reprint, Amsterdam, 1972. Reprinted, with only spelling and punctuation changes, as 'The trauailes of Job Hortop, which Sir John Hawkins set on land within the Bay of Mexico, after his departure from the Haven of S. John de Ullua in Nueva Espanna, the 8. of October 1568', in Hakluyt 1598, 487–95. The text of this revised version cited below

is from Hakluyt.

**Richard Hakluyt**, *The Principall Navigations, Voiages and Discoveries of the English nation* ... (London, 1589); enlarged second edition, Richard Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations* ..., 3 vols. (London, 1598–1600).

Facsimile reprint of the first edition, ed. D.B. Quinn and R.A. Skelton (Hakluyt Society, Cambridge, 1965); reprint of the second edition, 12 vols. (Glasgow, 1903–1905).

**N.B.** In the present work the first edition is cited as Hakluyt 1589, and the second as Hakluyt 1598.

## CITATION OF PERIOD SOURCES / TREATMENT OF EXTRACTS

For full titles and details of primary printed sources, see the list above. For the primary manuscript sources, see note 7 above (Cotton MS account), section 9f below (the Portuguese official complaints), and the Appendix (evidence of the English captives). In all the period texts quoted below the letters /u/ and /j/ are changed into /v/ and /i/ in words where this spelling is modern practice; and the italicising of names (and sometimes dates) is not followed, except in the case of certain instances of ship's names.

**The public account** = *A true declaration of the troublesome voyage* ... , 1569.

Changes in the 1589 version other than in spelling and punctuation are inserted in square brackets.

**Miles Phillips' account** = Hakluyt 1589, 562–80.

**Job Hortop's account** = *The Rare Travailes of Job Hortop* ... , 1591.

Significant changes in the revised edition (Hakluyt 1598, 487–95) are inserted. Additions are indicated in square brackets [ ]. Altered text follows the original and is indicated in curly brackets { }.

**The Cotton MS account** = Williamson, *Hawkins*, 1927, 496–514

Foliation of the original shown. Square brackets indicate gaps in the damaged text, the material within the brackets either (a) conjectural text in italics, most of the words as suggested by Williamson, or (b) unascertainable text, indicated as [?...] for gaps involving a single word or several words, and as [?...//] for gaps involving three or four lines.

**Evidence of the English captives.**<sup>23</sup>

For a list of the names of the individuals whose evidence is cited, with details of the sources of the evidence of each, in the Archivo General de la Nación [Mexico] (AGN) and the Archivo General de Indias (AGI), see the Appendix below. Translations from the Spanish as supplied in the Conway material.

**The Portuguese official complaints** = translation from the Latin of Public Record Office, London, 'State Papers, Foreign, Elizabeth, vol.99'.

---

<sup>23</sup> That is, those individuals captured by the Spaniards who had served on this English voyage, mainly native English, but a number Welsh or Irish, and a handful from various continental polities (excluding, however, a few Frenchmen who had been captured from a French ship which had accompanied the English voyage).



# THE VOYAGE: EVIDENCE AND COMMENTARY

## 1. FROM PLYMOUTH TO THE CANARY ISLANDS

(2 OCTOBER – 4 NOVEMBER 1567)

### (a) The public account (553)

The shippes departed from Plymmouth, the ii. day of October, Anno 1567. and had reasonable wether, until the 7. day, at which tyme 40. leagues northe from cape Finester, there arose an extreame storme, which continued 4. daies, in such sorte, that the fleete was dispersed, & all our great botes loste,<sup>24</sup> & the Jesus our chieffe shippe, in such case, as not thought able to serve the viage:<sup>25</sup> wherupon in the same storme we sett our course homeward, determining to geve over the viadge: but the ii. [eleventh] day of the same moneth the winde changed with faire wether, whereby we were animated to followe our enterprise, & so did, directinge our course with the Ilandes of grand Canaries, where according to an order before prescribed, all our shippes before dispersed, met in one of those Ilandes called Gomera where we toke water & departed from thence the iiiii. daye of November, towardes the coaste of Guynea ...

### (b) Miles Phillips' account (562)

... Upon munday being the second of October, 1567, the weather being reasonable fayre, our Generall M. John Hawkins, having commaunded all his captaines and masters to be in a readinesse to make sayle with him, hee himselfe being imbarked in the Jesus, whereof was appointed for Master, Robert Barret, hoysed sayle, and departed from Plymmoth upon his intended voyage for the parts of Africa & America, being accompanied with five other sayle of shippes, as namely the Mynion, wherein went for Captaine Master John Hampton, and John Garret Master. The William and John, wherein was Captaine Thomas Bolton, and James Raunce Master. The Judith, in whome was Captain M. Francis Drake now knight,<sup>26</sup> and the Angel, whose Master, as also the Captaine and Master of the Swallow I now remember not. And so sayling in companie together upon our voyage untill the tenth of the same moneth, an extreame storme then tooke us neere unto cape Finister, which dured for the space of foure dayes, and so separated our shippes, that wee had lost one another, and our Generall finding the Jesus to be but in yll case, was in minde to give over the voyage, and to returne home. However the eleventh of the same moneth the seas waxing calme, and the wind comming fayre, he altered his purpose, and held on the former entended voyage: And so comming to the Ilande of Gomera being one of the Ilands of the Canaries, where according to an order before appoynted, we met with all our shippes which were before dispersed, wee then tooke

---

<sup>24</sup> This loss of small craft, detailed in other English sources below as a pinnace and several long-boats, helps to explain why Hawkins later added to his fleet a number of small vessels captured from the Portuguese and suitable for operating in shallow rivers.

<sup>25</sup> For the storm, Hawkins' behaviour in it, and religion on the fleet, see James A. Williamson, *Sir John Hawkins* (London, 1927), 145–6; P.E.H. Hair, 'Protestants as pirates, slavers, and proto-missionaries: Sierra Leone 1568 and 1582', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 21 (1970), 211. The fleet carried no chaplain and the Inquisition made much of daily prayers and Scripture readings aboard having been conducted by laymen (several literates), as well as of the use of a 'reformed' prayer book — making those who attended, albeit compulsorily, heretics, that is, in practice, all the individuals tried. Note that the Spaniards called all Protestants *Luteranos*, whether Lutheran, Calvinist or 'Anglican', hence the term is translated 'Lutherites'.

<sup>26</sup> Drake was knighted in 1581.

in freshe water and departed from thence the fourth of November ...<sup>27</sup>

**(c) Job Hortop's account (3: 487)**

It is not unknowen unto sundry person, that I Job Hortop<sup>28</sup> [pouder-maker] was born in Lincolne shire, in the town of Bourne, and after became servant in Redriffe to one {from my age of twelve yeeres brought up in Redriffe neere London, with M.} Frances Lee, a gun powder maker, in whose service {who was the Queenes Majesties powder-maker, whom I served, until} I was prest forth for the Gynnie voiage, wherof sir Jhon Haukins<sup>29</sup> was general {to go on the 3. voyage to the West Indies, with the right worshipful Sir John Hawkins}, and by him I was appointed to be gunner of {one of the Gunners in} one of hir Majesties ships called the Jesus of Libicke {Lubeck}.<sup>30</sup> From Plimoth we put to sea in October 1567, whereupon a great storme arose, and our Generall appointed to meete at the Iland of Teneriffe, he being then in the Libicke, [He directed his Vice-admiral, that if foule weather did separate them, to meete at the Iland of Tenerif. After which by the space of seven dayes and seven nights, we had such stormes at sea, that we lost our long boats and a pinnesse, with some men:] but comming to the Iland,<sup>31</sup> we heard that our ships were at the Iland of Gomera {our Generall heard that his Vice-admirall with the Swallow, and the William and John were at the Iland called Gomera}, to which place we immediately set saile, and beeing come thether we tooke in fresh water {where finding his Vice-admirall, he anchored, tooke in fresh water}, from thence to {and set saile for} Cape blanke ...

**(d) The Cotton MS account (ff.18v–19)**

... the Quenes Majestie gave new comaundments [*that he*] showlde, seing the Portugals were gone,<sup>32</sup> make his v[ioadge unto] Guynea, and there making slaves negros, with [*them*] to sayle over from that coast to the Weste or Span[ish Indies] as he had heretofore done in other vioadges. Oure generall [*with all*] spede nowe made ready to goe to the sea, and abowt the [...?] sett sayle owt of the range of Plemowth with the aforesaid [*ships*] and pinace, havinge in all in them menne & boyes 408 persons. The thirde daye after we had bene at the sea oure generall gave instructions to all the ships that if there showlde [*fort*]une to come any fowle wether and thereby they showlde be sondered one from another, they showlde repaire to

<sup>27</sup> The early part of Phillips' account so closely resembles Hawkins' account that it seems likely that Phillips composed it with the 1569 print in front of him.

<sup>28</sup> The revised version refers to Job Hortop only as 'I.H.', but Hakluyt restored the full name given in the shorter version.

<sup>29</sup> Hawkins was knighted only in 1588, and therefore was not 'sir John' in 1567–1568. In contrast, in his revised version Hortop later introduces references to 'Captaine Drake' and 'M. Francis Drake' but adds 'now sir Francis Drake'.

<sup>30</sup> In the dedication to Queen Elizabeth, Hortop stated that he was 'prest forth to serve in a gunners roome {for one of the Gunners} for the Ginnie voyage [in your Majesties ships] {for the West Indian voiage}'.

<sup>31</sup> At Teneriffe occurred an incident aboard the flag-ship not noted in any of the printed English sources but reported at length in the Cotton MS account. Hawkins was struck and wounded by a lieutenant, Edward Dudley, whom he first condemned to death and then pardoned. The passage is not included below, but see Williamson, *Hawkins*, 147–8. The incident must have been known to Phillips and Hortop, both of whom served on the flag-ship.

<sup>32</sup> For the Portuguese renegades who offered to direct the voyage to the Gold Coast but who fled before the ships set sail, see the Introduction.

Sancta Crux, a road in the ile of Tenerife of the Canaria, where he wolde water and take in other necessaryes, with divers other articles besides this in the saide instructions. The 4<sup>th</sup> daye after we departed owte of Plemowth there arose a great tempest and lasted 4 dayes, in the which time, the tempest being verry great and the wether darck, oure fleete were sondred, the Mynion, the William and John & the Swallow together, the Judith alone by her selfe, the Jhesus and the Angell by them selves. In this storm the Mynion lost her long boate with 2 menne in her at her stern, the Swallow lost the pinace afore named which she towed at her stern and 2 menne in her,<sup>33</sup> the Jhesus lost her long boate which she towed at her sterne, but thorowghe the generalls industric saved the menne. The wether was verry extreame and browghte the Jhesus in suche case that she opened in the sterne afte, and leakes broak up in divers places in her, but where she oppened in the sterne the leake was so great that into one place there was thrust 15 peaces of bese to stoppe the place [?...///] looked ever [?...]rde. Oure generall bare a good [countenance although he] sawe the storme still endured and [the ship kept from sinking only with] continuall pumping night and day [and the company weary, yet] knowing moore then he wold the co[mpany should know of the] weaknes of the shippe, had driven it of [to tell them thereof] hitherto, but nowe not being able to doe it, [or to forbear if the] storme showlde continewe any longer to say [to them that it was not] possible to keape the shippe above the water, [for as fast as we] stopped one leake another broake up, he [called the company] together and oppened vnto them that which th[ey knew not, and saying] that we were but dead menne and in [a ship that was] so weake that she was not able to endure [the wind or the sea] either, desired them to praye unto allmyghtye [God that He would] take us to his mercye. His cowntenance never [shewed his] sorrowe, but his wordes perced the hartes of all his [company], and it semed unto them that deathe had somoned th[em] when they harde him recite the aforesaid wordes, for they [knew] such wordes cowlde not issue owte from so invincible a mynde [without] great cawse. There was not one that cowlde refraine his eyes from teares, the which when oure generall sawe he begann to enter in prayer and besowght them to praye with him, the which, indeed he yet letted not with great trayvayle to serch the shippe fore and afte for her leakes. Thus we passed the 4<sup>th</sup> daye at the mercye of God. About midnyght the wynd beganne to cease and the wether to be faire. When the daye, being the 5<sup>th</sup> daye, came oure generall called the companye together, and geving thanks unto allmyghty God that he had preserved us in this tempest, being before determyned to put rome with Ingland if the storme [held], tolde them that nowe, the wynde being northerlye, and the wether faire, he wolde goe onwarde in the vioadge, and then with the Angell in oure companye we sayled towards the isles of [Canaria] [?...///] she was the Judith [?...] and saluted the admirall [?...]...

**(e) Extract from a report of the Spanish ambassador, 12 July 1567, on preparations for the voyage<sup>34</sup>**

I am assured that Hawkins and his company will go to New Spain after they have captured their negroes in Guinea, because besides the trifles they take to barter for their slaves, they are taking a quantity of cloths and linen which are not goods fit for that country, and they also carry quantities of beans and other vegetables which are the food of the blacks, and the slaves are not usually taken anywhere but to New Spain and the islands.

<sup>33</sup> The pinnacle was described earlier as of 'the burthen of vij tonnes to serve divers townes' (f.17). Pinnaces were small masted vessels, of very varying sizes, and this one was very small.

<sup>34</sup> In translation, *Calendar of State Papers, Spanish, 1558–67* (London, 1892), item 432.

*The ambassador was right as regards beans, but mistaken in supposing that cloths and linen were not traded in Guinea.*

#### **(f) Evidence of the English captives**

One day as he was going along the street unsuspectingly they fell upon him suddenly and hurried him aboard as they were short of people owing to the fact that they were going to Guinea which had the reputation of being an unhealthy country where they would die from fever. (William Cornelius, alias John Martin, sweeper)

*Cornelius, an Irishman, when examined by the Inquisition in Mexico in 1574, defended himself by claiming that, since he had always remained a Catholic, he hated the English and was the victim of circumstances (but he was eventually condemned and executed).<sup>35</sup> That he was forcibly impressed may have been true or one of his many untruths.*

... came as a soldier, under the promise to receive [a share of] one third of any profits there might be, the profits to be divided between the captain, the gentlemen, and the soldiers, and to come from the cloths, linen and other things they had brought with them and from the loot they might obtain from attacking the Portuguese ... (William Sanders, soldier)<sup>36</sup>

... and loaded [in Plymouth] a quantity of merchandise, in the shape of some cloths, linens and ironware, and some black slaves ... (Walter Jones, armourer)

... slaves, together with a certain number they had brought from England ... (Richard Temple, gentleman adventurer)

... slaves, together with the sixty they had brought from England ... (Michael Sole, gentleman adventurer)

In their ships they had brought fifty blacks from England. (Robert Barrett, master of the flagship)

*It may be doubted whether attacks on the Portuguese were offered as an inducement before the voyage began. Reference to a 'number of slaves' brought from England was also made by Thomas Jones, bugler, and James Hen, sailor. Although termed 'slaves' by the English captives when interrogated by the Spaniards, the Africans brought from England were most likely either Guinea hostages carried off in earlier English voyages or volunteers from these voyages who, after training in England as interpreters, were being taken back to act as intermediaries in commerce.<sup>37</sup> It was later stated that some 'blacks' were brought to England on the ships that returned but it is not clear whether these were individuals newly obtained in Africa or individuals returning to England — or perhaps both.<sup>38</sup> The number taken from*

<sup>35</sup> See P.E.H. Hair, 'An Irishman before the Mexican Inquisition 1574–5', *Irish Historical Studies*, 26 (1970), 2–10.

<sup>36</sup> The captives, however, described Sanders as *contramestre* 'boatswain'.

<sup>37</sup> See P.E.H. Hair, 'Attitudes to Africans in English primary sources on Guinea up to 1650', *History in Africa*, 26 (1999), 67–8. The Portuguese and French had long used as interpreters and agents in Guinea Africans brought from there and trained in Europe.

<sup>38</sup> The English post-voyage claims for compensation included the following statement. 'There were ten or twelve Negroes or thereabouts in the Minion; whereof she brought seven into England and the rest died by the way homeward' (Edward Arber, ed. *An English Garner*, 7 vols., (Birmingham, vol. 5 1882), 120). For 'blacks' who may or may not have been brought to England from Spanish America by Drake in 1586, see D.B. Quinn, *Explorers and colonies: America, 1500–1625* (London, 1990), 'Turks, Moors, Blacks and others in Drake's West

---

*England is almost certain to have been far fewer than the numbers claimed by Sole and Barrett, who were either misunderstood by a clerk, or who deliberately exaggerated, for an unclear reason. Probably the actual number was in single figures. Earlier English voyages had been principally to Gold Coast and earlier interpreters trained in England were certainly from there. If these men were from Gold Coast, this may support the view that before he left Hawkins had either given thought to trading on that section of the coast, where the trade would be for gold not slaves, or at least had wished to make Spanish agents think this was his intention.*

## 2. AT TENERIFFE

(23 OCTOBER – ABOUT 1 NOVEMBER, 1567)

*No details about the events at Teneriffe — contacts with friendly Spaniards and a near confrontation with the authorities, as well as the Hawkins-Dudley quarrel (see note 9 above) — were given in the three accounts printed in the sixteenth century. This is the first point in the voyage where the events are told much less than fully in these printed sources.*

### (a) The Cotton MS account (ff.19v–21v)

... thus we sayled to the roade of [*Sancta Crux in Tenerife, and when*] we came neare where we showlde anchor, they of the castle fired a piece of salvo, and so [*our general commanded to fire as*] did a Spanish [*ship ...?... that*] ridde in the roade, that was bounde to the Indies [*whereupon our general*] comaunded to geve them a dossen peces againe [*for a courtesy and*] after we had ankered oure generall sent of [*a message to the governor*] that he came thether to gather his fleet together, which with [*extremity of weather*] was separated, and for his moneye to provide him [*self with divers*] necessaryes. Beinge, as he was, verry well knowen [*in this is*]land before, both the governor and all others said [*he was*] wellcome and showlde have anye thing that was in [*their power*] to serve his tourne. He had divers presentes se[*nt to the*] shore and divers of the principall of the iland [*came*] abourde, whom he feasted in all that might bee. That [*shew*]ing as it semed great frendshipp to oure generall, [*they aun*]swered him that he wolde come ashoure, but he aunswered [*that*] the Quenes Majestie had geven him comaundment to the contrarye. ...[omitted ff.20–21] ... we hard newes that that the Mynion, the William and John [and] the Swallow were at the Gomera, an ilond harde by th[is] Ile of Tenerife ...

*The omitted passage is a lengthy account of the Hawkins-Dudley quarrel and of negotiations with the Spanish authorities. The authorities were suspicious, and a new governor tried to lure Hawkins ashore while allegedly planning to fire on the English ships. Meanwhile Hawkins resumed contact with friendly Spanish traders and also with certain English traders resident on the island. The near confrontation with the Spanish authorities at Teneriffe has significance for the American aspect of the voyage but little for the Guinea aspect. The stay at Teneriffe has been given detailed study in chapter 7 of Antonio Rumeu de Armas, *Los Viajes de John Hawkins a America (1562–1595)* (Seville, 1947), a work which also considers Hawkins' earlier contacts with the Canary Islands, drawing on unpublished documents from Spanish archives. The date of arrival of the English ships at Santa Cruz is given in this work (207).*

### (b) The evidence of the English captives

*The captives gave limited evidence about the stay at Teneriffe, some of which is cited in Rumeu de Armas. One new trader was taken aboard the flagship.*

... about two years ago, more or less, he left England as a servant to Enrique Nuñez, an English merchant, who sent him to the islands [sic] of Teneriffe with Pedro Ribeiro, his agent. He was there a year with Pedro da Ponte ... when Hawkins came to the port of Teneriffe ... there came with him Enrique Nuñez, his friend, who, being the witness's master, made him embark on the flagship ... (Gregory Stevens, trader)

### 3. TOWARDS AND AT CAP BLANC

(? ABOUT 10 NOVEMBER – ABOUT 14 NOVEMBER 1567)

#### (a) The public account (553)

... one of those Ilandes called Gomera, where we toke water & departed from thence the iiii. daye of November towards the coaste of Guynea, and arived at cape Viride [Verde] the xviii. of November ...

*Miles Phillips, in his account, similarly passes over, without mention, an episode at Cap Blanc (on the Saharan coast) which is described in detail in the Cotton MS account, and in confirmatory and additional detail in the evidence of the English captives. Its significance for the Guinea aspect of the voyage is that it represented the first encounter with Portuguese individuals. Hawkins had, however, called at Cap Blanc in November 1564, on his second voyage (whether he called there on his first voyage is not known). The very full account of the second voyage by John Sparke, a participant, eventually published by Hakluyt in 1589, includes a description of Cap Blanc in part relevant to the events there of 1567, as follows.*

The 25. we came to Cape Blanco, which is upon the coast of Affrica,<sup>39</sup> and a place where the Portingals doe ride that fishe there, in the moneth of November especially, and is a very good place of fishing for Pargoes, Mullet and Dogge fishe.<sup>40</sup> In this place the Portingals have no holde for their defense, but have rescue of the Barbarians, whom they entertain as their souldiers, for the time of their being there, and for their fishing upon that coast of Affrica, doe pay a certaine tribute to the King of the Moores. The people of that part of Affrica, are tawnie, having long haire, without any apparell, saving before their privie members. Their weapons in warres, are bowes, and arrowes.<sup>41</sup> The 26. we departed from S. Avis Baye,<sup>42</sup> within Cape

---

<sup>39</sup> Cap Blanc was in this period sometimes considered to be 'on the coast of Ginnie' (Hakluyt 1589, 144).

<sup>40</sup> Earlier English voyages to Guinea had passed Cap Blanc far out to sea, to avoid the inshore shoals (e.g. in 1555, Hakluyt 1589, 100). But in 1555 the English encountered 'great store of fish' and Portuguese fishermen north of Cap Blanc, and in 1556 at the cape 'certaine Carvels fishing for Pargoes' (Hakluyt 1589, 99–100, 113).

<sup>41</sup> The land around Cap Blanc is part of the Sahara desert and totally arid. The district was very thinly populated by a wandering group of the Berber people who survived on fish, shell-fish and sea birds. In the past they had been slave-raided and it is doubtful whether they regularly engaged in trade with the Iberian fishermen who visited this coast. An Englishman in the 1590s, 'walking on shore ... found it a waste, desolate, barren and sandie place ... the tawny Moores, so wilde, as they would but call to my Caravels from the shore' (Hakluyt 1598, 3: 575). It is not recorded that the English encountered any of the 'Moores' in 1564 or 1567, and Sparke's description of them was probably based on a printed source. That they acted as soldiers for the Portuguese does not appear to be recorded elsewhere and, if correct, probably applied not to the Cap Blanc district but to the down-coast Portuguese fort on Arguim Island, where commercial contact with the desert dwellers as well as with trans-Saharan traders was certainly the case. The rulers of Morocco ('the King of the Moores') claimed sovereignty over the Cap Blanc district and Arguim — where in the 1580s the 'King of the Moors' had a representative at the Portuguese fort: Théodore Monod, *L'Isle d'Arguin (Mauritanie). Essai Historique* (Lisbon, 1983), 26. But since the Moroccan rulers had no regular control over the local inhabitants and only limited marine power, it may be doubted whether in fact the Portuguese bothered to pay tribute to them for the right to fish off this particular coast. However, since the Portuguese still retained forts in Morocco, possibly the terms of relationship with Fez included agreement over general fishing rights. Portuguese and other European ships touched land in the Cap Blanc district because of the availability of a supply of fresh water.

<sup>42</sup> This toponym is not recorded elsewhere but may be a mangled form of 'S. Anne', the name of the cape to the south of Cap Blanc, the bay visited being the one between the two capes now known as Baie de Lévrier. It is 'well-stocked with fish, the abundance of sardines being so great that shoals of these fish have sometimes been mistaken for dangers': *African Pilot*, 12th ed. (London, 1967), 256.

Blanco, where we refreshed our selves with fishe, and other necessities ... (Hakluyt 1589, 525)

**(b) Job Hortop's account** (1591 [3]; Hakluyt 1598, 487)

... from thence to Cape blanke, where [in the way] we tooke a [Portugal] Carvell full of fish called Mullets, and from thence to Cape Verd ...

**(c) The Cotton MS account** (ff.21v–22v)

... we had newes that the Minyon, the William and John [and] the Swallow were at the Gomera, an ilond harde by th[is] Ile of Teneriffe. Oure Generall, hearing this, departed to Gomera with the Jhesus and the Angell, having sente the Judith thether before to geve them knowledge of his [*being*] in Tenerife, and thether we came also, where abowte allhalowntide in the beginning of November we mette all together againe, and for joye everye shipp discharged divers peces of ordnaunce. The governor of this ilond came abowrde to oure generall and offered him that any thinge that was in the ilonde was at his comaundemente. Oure generall gave him thankes, and after he had fullie watred here and taken in other necessaryes, within ij dayes after we had ridden there oure generall comaunded to sette sayle and departed, directing oure course towardes Cabo Blanco [...//] almost vnrigged and [...] this tyme sight of ij sayles. [*Our generall because that h*]e wolde understande howe the [*said ships were left without a*]ny bodye in them comaunded the Judith [*and the Angel to go*] with the aforesaid ij sayles and to will [*their masters to come*] on to the port where he nowe was come to [*wherein certain oth*]er ships did ride with much saltfish of divers [*kinds, and the ne*]xt daye after we were within the Judith and [*the Angel came*] with one of the ij sayles with them that they went af[ter, which was a] carvell of Viana in Portugall. Oure generall sente fo[r the master a]bowrde and demaunded of him what vessels these [*were and what*] the menne that belonged to them were become. Th[*e master answered*] that not 20 dayes paste there came thether certain [*Frenchmen*] whoe both spoyled all thinges they fownde and verry [...] were Portugals alsoe, for the feare of the which the [*Portugals had*] all fledde thence at that tyme to a castell that they [*had in the*] cowntreye and never came to the porte sence.<sup>43</sup> After tha[t he had] vnderstoode this by the Portugall aforesaide, oure generall tolde [*the*] Portugall that seing he had founde these three vessels with[*out*] any living thing in them they were his by the lawe of [*the sea and*] that he had bene abowrde with them and had appointed to have one of them, which was a carvell, a newe shippe, alongeste with him to serve his towrne in the vioadge, and the other ij, except he might taulk with the owners or some manne that had chardg in them, he muste needes sette them afyre at his departing, considering that the cowntreye in the which we were was of infidels. Oure generall desired the said master of the carvell of Viana to se whether he cowlde fynd owte any of the menne of the said ships and bring them with him to him. The aforesaid master was ij dayes seeking for to meete some of the menne of these saide ships, and the second daye towardes night he mette with the masters of ij of them [...//] to sett them afyre at [...]ew it to the quenes majestie his m[istress [...] suche a foote in the lande of I[ngland ?... the master] of one of these ships awnsweared oure g[eneral that he] did confesse that the ships were forfeited [*according to*] the lawe of the sea, but seing that he [*had need of*] but one of them it were greate pitye to burn [*the others*]. Oure generall asked the saide master whether he wolde [*buy them*] of him. The Portugall awnsweared that he had no [*money and*] for wante thereof cowlde not. Oure gencrall

<sup>43</sup> The Portuguese 'castell' was at Arguim (Arguin), 65 km SSE of Cap Blanc.



[*answered*] that if he wolde buye the ii ships with all things [*in them*] he showlde finde him reasonable, for he showlde geve him for them 40 duccattes [*and give*] him a bill of his hand to paye them to him in London [*in ?...*] yeares. The Portugall did it, but he mervayled thereat that the [*ships*] with all other thinges in them [*which*] was worthe above [*?...*] duccattes the generall wolde requeste no more for them; [*and*] oure generall wolde not have demaunded one penny for them if it had not bene nedfull so to doe considering his righte to them. This ended, after we had ridden here abowte 15 dayes<sup>44</sup> we departed with this newe carvayle in oure companye towards Cabo Verde in Guynae, leaving the ij other ships behinde in the possession of the Portugall aforesaide.<sup>45</sup>

*Williamson comments upon this episode (Hawkins, 149–50), but has not entirely understood the sequence of events at 'Cape Blanco' (Cap Blanc, on the Saharan coast). The evidence of the captive Englishmen helps to fill in the gaps in the mutilated Cotton MS. The respect alleged to have been shown by Hawkins for 'the law of the sea', and for the law of Christendom, in respect of the supply of ships to infidels — though it must be doubted whether the Berbers of the Cap Blanc interior or their notional overlord, the ruler of Morocco, could have made any use of the abandoned vessels<sup>46</sup> — may not have been entirely an invention of the author, since the evidence of the captives to some extent substantiates this aspect of the episode. The Spanish authorities showed much interest in Hawkins' activities at Cap Blanc, the Portuguese vessel acquired there having accompanied the English fleet to the Caribbean; and one of the charges brought against the English captives was that they had piratically stolen the Portuguese ship.*

*When interrogated, all the Englishmen agreed that some crewless and looted ships, containing only 'stinking fish' and salt, and one of them partly burnt out, had been found at anchor in a bay near Cape Blanco, and they admitted Hawkins' removal of one of them. In justification, most of the captives stated categorically that none of the crew of the ships had been found, and the wording of their evidence strongly implied that no person at all had been met at Cape Blanco. This last point was, however, contradicted by the remaining captives, perhaps because they were better informed, as it was also contradicted in the Cotton MS account. According to these statements, the English met with an old Portuguese man who informed them that the Portuguese vessels — no doubt peacefully fishing — had been attacked by French ships, and that as a result their crews had abandoned their ships and fled to the interior. The story is plausible since Iberian fishing boats off the Saharan coast were regularly attacked by passing French and English ships. Hawkins explained to the old man that he was removing one of the ships, but promised to pay the owner after the voyage, and he gave the old man some trade goods and some rigging for one of the remaining vessels.*

*A few captives provided a more elaborate story, to the effect that the old man went off to find the missing crews and returned with one individual, apparently the owner of one of the ships. Valentine Green, a trader on the Jesus, added details of a discussion between Hawkins and*

<sup>44</sup> This length of stay is implausible, does not fit later dates, and must be wrong — '15' is perhaps a misreading for '5'.

<sup>45</sup> It appears that the vessel obtained at Cap Blanc was in the fleet when it left Africa (see note 82 below), and if it was the 'new ship' mentioned in the English post-voyage claim for compensation (Arber, *English Garner*, 110), then it was presumably sunk or captured at San Juan de Ulúa.

<sup>46</sup> However, in the 1580s a Portuguese memorialist worried lest the Moroccans should travel to Arguim and build galleys there, to war against Christian shipping (Monod, *Arguin*, 27).

*the Portuguese on the legal niceties of the situation which approximates closely to the discussion reported in the Cotton MS account. Hawkins claimed the remaining abandoned vessels and then sold them to the Portuguese, on a bond whereby the purchaser undertook to make payment in the future. This provides the first instance on this voyage of Hawkins' penchant for the preparation and deployment of written documents purportedly sanctifying or legitimating an aspect of behaviour liable to be considered illegal by third parties. The discrepancies in the English evidence, particularly in respect of the more elaborate story, may indicate a degree of invention, by collusion among some of the captives, but may instead point to mere forgetfulness and varying degrees of knowledge among a large company of interrogated Englishmen. (For instance, the evidence of Thomas Bennett, below, represents confusion between two episodes, one at Cap Blanc and a later one beyond Cape Verde.) Thus, it can be accepted that Hawkins removed a Portuguese ship which had been attacked by French vessels and abandoned, but it remains rather less than certain that he negotiated in friendly fashion with some Portuguese and entered into financial arrangements with them.*

... went to Cabo Blanco/Cap Blanc on the Barbary coast to find fish to victual the ships and bread and wine and other subsistence,<sup>47</sup> and in the port of Cap Blanc discovered two caravels and a ship<sup>48</sup> with nobody aboard them, anchored, some without masts and all without sails, and nothing below except some fish. It looked as though they had been looted. The general John Hawkins took one of the caravels and refitted it and attached it to his fleet, and left the other two ships anchored there as he had found them. From there ... (Robert Barrett, master of the flagship).

... to Cap Blanc at the port of which they found three ships anchored and on overhauling them found them loaded with fish and salt but without any person or living thing aboard, and lying off the coast they saw two small vessels. The general sent to ask them if they knew to whom the three anchored vessels belonged, whereupon one of the two small vessels came to where the English fleet was, and out of it came an old Portuguese who said that he came from Viana. Speaking with the general who asked him if he knew to whom the three vessels belonged he told him that he did not know, and the general begged him to send for the crew of these vessels, because he was a general and could not leave them on a heathen coast but would have to burn them. The Portuguese man went off in a boat to look for them and at the end of three days returned with a man who, as far as the deponent can recollect, was called Maya, a Portuguese. The general asked him if he owned these vessels and the man answered yes. He then asked him why he had left the vessels unprotected, and the Portuguese explained that they had arrived there ten days before the English fleet and had fought a battle with certain French ships in which the Portuguese had sunk a small French vessel and the French had killed three or four Portuguese and had taken a tender belonging to the King of Portugal. Out of fear, the Portuguese had abandoned the ships and plunged into the interior of the country. The general told him, 'I have need of one of these ships to carry black slaves because I have to go to Guinea, but as all of the ships are mine in accordance with the law of the sea, I will sell you the other two'. The Portuguese said to him, 'Sir, I am well aware that that they

<sup>47</sup> Cap Blanc being on the coast of the Sahara desert, there was no possibility of obtaining 'bread and wine' other than from the stores of another vessel. The suggestion that Hawkins had arranged for his 'agent' in the Canaries to stock provisions at Cap Blanc to await his arrival is far-fetched: Antonio Rumeu de Armas, *Los Viajes de John Hawkins a América (1562–1595)* (Seville, 1947), 231.

<sup>48</sup> The distinction here between a caravel and a ship is unclear, and all three ships seem to have been small fishing vessels.

are yours as you found them deserted, but I have nothing with which to buy them, as you think best'. Then John Hawkins said to him, 'You desire to buy them — I will arrange the matter so as to benefit you, while at the same time protecting the interests of the Queen', to which the Portuguese answered, 'Sir, do as you think best'. Then John Hawkins made out a bond whereby Maya bound himself to pay the general forty ducats for the two ships within two years. The general left him the two ships and some supplies, and took the other one, putting a crew aboard ... (Valentine Green, trader)

... where the Portuguese were accustomed to fish ... another caravel arrived ... (John Brown, musician)

... one ship was so badly burned they could not tell if it had been lateen or ship rigged ... a small Portuguese caravel was heading for Cap Blanc and the port of La Ensenada [The Bay] ... The newcomers explained that they were Portuguese and had come to fish ... Hawkins bought wine from the newcomer, paying in cloth ... told them he would pay the owner [of the vessel removed] on return after the voyage (Anthony Goddard, soldier, the last part confirmed by William Holland, Richard Temple and George Fitzwilliam, gentlemen adventurers)

... to the Barbary coast, the country of the King of Fez ... an old Portuguese explained that there had been a French attack ... (Michael Sole, gentleman adventurer)

... an old Portuguese came on shore with terms of peace ... (Richard Temple, gentleman adventurer)

... told by an old negro whom they met on the shore ... (Christopher Bingham, gentleman adventurer)

... the ship was the old man's property ... (Christopher Robinson, gunner)

... found a Portuguese man who explained that after a fight with the French they had abandoned the ships and escaped into the interior ... (John Bones, sailor)

... four Portuguese caravels and a French ship, because the Portuguese had taken the French ship and killed all the Frenchmen, and the ships were anchored in the port, and they did not find in them any gold or silver, just some fish, and John Hawkins took the French ship ... they stayed at Cap Blanc two days ... (Thomas Bennett, tailor/gunner)

... gave him some fittings ... (William Holland, gentleman adventurer)

... they found three caravels with nobody in them, and John Hawkins took one, and there was also a caravel burned out, and they found nothing except fish and salt in the caravel they took, and they left the others ... stayed there two or three days ... (William Sanders, soldier)

... with his own eyes saw John Williams, an Englishman who died in the battle at San Juan de Ulúa, enter one of the ships and finding in it an image of St Paul and a cross, took them and threw them into the sea ... (William Collins)<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Jiménez Rueda, *Corsarios*, 414. Collins, a man of some education who had worked in Spain, was examined by the Inquisition in 1572-1573, and here, as when dealing with the later episode at Cacheu, his evidence mainly related to English 'heretical' or anti-Catholic practices. However, some of the evidence was reported by a Spanish cellmate, Pedro de Trejo — according to a modern Spanish historian, 'interminable discussions' between the two, reported by a man who was 'cultured, a poet, but something of a dissembling tell-tale' (*culto, poeta y algo hipócrita*: Huerga, *Inquisición*, 950; cf. Jiménez Rueda, *Corsarios*, xxiii-xxv). Therefore some of the reported statements by Collins may have been invented. Yet it is likely that Collins was not amiss to admitting or claiming such practices in the hope that this would ameliorate his ultimate condemnation and sentence; and the extract in the text is in fact from his own evidence. That some of the English, in iconoclastic glee, did attack Catholic symbols when encountered is by no means implausible.

#### 4. AT CAPE VERDE (ABOUT 18 NOVEMBER 1567)

##### (a) The public account (553)

... and arived at cape Viride [Verde] the xviii. of November; where we landed 150. men hoping to obtaine some Negrose, where we gatt but fewe, and those with great hurte and damage to our men, which cheifelye proceeded of their envenymed arrowes: & althoughe in the beginning, it [they] seemed to be but small hurtes, yet there hardlye escaped anye that had bloude drawne of them, and [but] dyed in strange sorte with there mouthes shutt, some x. dayes before he [sic] died, and after there woundes were hole,<sup>50</sup> where I my selfe had one of the greatest woundes, yet thanks be to god escaped. From thence ...

*In early December 1564, for two days, Hawkins' second voyage had called at Cape Verde. Sparke's account of the visit, quoted below, has relevance for the 1567 visit, particularly in its misleading reference to the gentle nature of the local Africans in their relation with Europeans — although this did not inhibit Hawkins from attempting a slave raid and perhaps encouraged him to repeat the attempt in 1567. On both voyages, activities at Cape Verde were the earliest manifestation of Hawkins' aggressive approach to African populations and his error in supposing that slaving could be successfully pursued by slave-raiding.*

These people are all blacke, and are called Negroes, without any apparell, saving before their privities: of stature goodly men, and well liking, by reason of their foode ... To speake somewhat of the sundry sortes of these Guyneans. The people of Cape Verde, are called Leophares, and counted the goodliest men of al other, saving the Manicongoes ... These Leophares have warres against the Jeloffes, which are borderers by them: their weapons are bowes, and arrowes, targets, and short daggers, darts also, but varying from other Negroes: for whereas the other use a long dart, to fight with in their handes, they carry five or six small ones a peece, which they cast with.<sup>51</sup> These men also are more civill then any other, because of their dailie traffike with the Frenchmen,<sup>52</sup> and are of nature very gentle, and loving ... wee came away, in that pretending to have taken Negroes there perforce, the Mynions men gave them there to understand of our comming, and our pretence, wherefore they did avoide the

---

<sup>50</sup> For the history of European contact with the use of poisoned arrows in this locality, see below. Given that little time elapsed between the English assault on the village and the counter-attack with poisoned arrows (as noted below), the Africans must have had a stock of either poison or ready-poisoned arrows. While this testifies to regular local confrontations and warfare — since the poison was patently not prepared merely in order to resist any possible attack from the ships of occasionally passing Europeans — the poison was mainly a deterrent weapon. It did not immediately disable the enemy in battle but knowledge of its existence and eventual effect deterred enemy attack.

<sup>51</sup> The Lebu were in a later century recorded as being the inhabitants in the immediate vicinity of Cape Verde (but see André Donelha, *Descrição da Serra Leoa e dos Rios de Guiné do Cabo Verde/An Account of Sierra Leone and the Rivers of Guinea of Cape Verde*, ed. A. Teixeira da Mota and P.E.H. Hair (Lisbon, 1977), 281, note 206) — perhaps 'Leophares' was a term derived from 'Lebu', but no other source records it. The Jolof/Wolof, the main inhabitants of the region, had weapons similar to those described, apparently as used by the 'Leophares' (André Álvares de Almada, *Tratado Breve dos Rios de Guiné*, ed. L. Silveira (Lisbon, 1946), cap. 1, p.12; *Brief Treatise on the Rivers of Guinea (c.1594)*, trans. and ed. P.E.H. Hair, Liverpool, 1984, chap. 1/17)). The modern Lebu may be considered a section of the Wolof, and this is the only pre-1700 reference to the population around Cape Verde as a separate named entity. For both peoples, see David P. Gamble, *The Wolof of Senegambia* (London, 1957).

<sup>52</sup> By the 1560s, the Portuguese naval defence of the Mina gold trade had forced French enterprise in Guinea to concentrate on Senegambia and a humbler trade in hides.

snares we had laid for them.<sup>53</sup> (Hakluyt 1589, 525)

*Between these two visits of Hawkins to Cape Verde another English voyage had called there and had engaged in an encounter with the local Africans relevant to the Hawkins episode. The voyage led by George Fenner visited the cape in January 1567, eleven months before Hawkins arrived, and, intending to trade, sent a party ashore to negotiate with a larger party of Africans assembled there, with disastrous results.*

... we came to an anker at the cape, in a road fast by the Westernmost side of two hills<sup>54</sup> ... and there we concluded to goe aland, which was halfe a mile from us ... by the counsell of William Bats, both Captaine and merchants and divers of the company went without armour: for he sayd, that although the people were blacke and naked, yet they were civill ... [and so] to goe without weapon. ... At their comming to the shore there were 100. Negroes or upward, with their bowes and arrowes ... the one demanded pledges of the other [and hostages were exchanged] ... the negroes desired to have a sighte of our wares ... [but after a time] one of the Negroes a shoare began to blow a pipe ... [the English hostages were carried off and an attack on the English began] ... many of them were hurt with their poysoned arrowes: and the poyson is uncurable if the arrowe enter within the skinne and drawe bloud, and except the poyson be presently suckt out, or the place where any man is hurt, be furthwith cut away, he dieth within foure dayes, and within three houres after they be hurt or pricked, wheresoever it be, although but at the litle toe, yet it striketh up to the heart, and taketh away the stomacke, and causeth the partie marveilously to vomit, being able to brooke neither meate nor drinke. ... [*An attempt to ransom the prisoners failed, even with the intervention of some French, despite the later being*] very welcome to the Negroes ... they woulde not deliver them giving us this answe.<sup>55</sup> That there was in the forsayde roade three weekes before wee came, an English shippe which had taken three of their people, and untill wee did bring or sende them againe, wee shoulde not have our men, although wee would give our three shippes with their furniture. ... Of our men that were hurt by the Negroes arrowes, foure died, and one to save his life, had his arme cut off ... onely two recovered of their hurts ... (Hakluyt 1589, 144–6)

*Why were Fenner's men attacked? It appears that they were specifically targeted as Englishmen. Before Hawkins' first visit to Cape Verde in 1564, the only English visit to this district seems to have been a brief one in 1557 when some Africans 'waved ... on shore' a boat party and offered hides, ivory and musk but sought a 'pledge'. No trading followed but it was noted that 'the Frenchmen had a great trade there' (Hakluyt 1589, 123). Although the Portuguese obtained Jolof slaves in their early decades in Guinea, by the mid sixteenth century the Senegal coast seems to have mainly exported other commodities, the French in*

<sup>53</sup> While travelling to Guinea, Hawkins' fleet had encountered the *Minion*, an English vessel also heading to Guinea but intending to trade on the Gold Coast. We lack a detailed account of the voyage of this ship (Teixeira da Mota and Hair, *East of Mina*, 17). According to Sparke, it reached Cape Verde before Hawkins did, and was in contact with the local Africans, although it is not clear how Hawkins learned this — or why the *Minion* revealed Hawkins' slaving intention.

<sup>54</sup> The two hills are now termed 'Les Mamelles'. One would have expected the landing to have been made, not on 'the Westernmost side', but on the east side, in the bay bordered by modern Dakar.

<sup>55</sup> Communication between the English and the Africans was probably in French. Apart from the local presence of Frenchmen, the English had a French-speaking interpreter aboard and some Africans from Senegal had been in France (Almada, *Tratado Breve*, cap. 2, 17; translation, chap. 2/7).

particular concentrating on hides, gum, and ivory.<sup>56</sup> By this period all commodities were obtained by regular trading methods. Whatever had happened earlier or still happened elsewhere, in the decades before Hawkins arrived almost certainly slave raiding was not a feature of Afro-European encounter at Cape Verde or generally on the Senegal coast. His irruption into an organised pattern of 'friendly' trading was therefore particularly heinous — and foolish. It may well be that his attempt in 1564 to 'snare' Africans and thus to slave-raid initiated the reaction against the English — a reaction perhaps encouraged by the French — which eventually led to the attack on Fenner's men.

However, the immediate reason was stated to be the removal of three Africans by an English ship very recently. This episode remains mysterious. Williamson suggested (Hawkins, 160) that the English ship which removed the Africans was one of the fleet commanded by Hawkins' substitute, Lovell, which left England in early November 1566 and in February 1567 attacked Portuguese vessels off the Cape Verde Islands. No detailed account of this voyage exists, but in a Portuguese 'book of complaints' it is claimed that an attack by Lovell's fleet occurred 'at the end of 1566 and the beginning of 1567', that is, a short time before the Fenner fleet reached Cape Verde, and Williamson interpreted the source to mean that the attack occurred 'at Cape Verde'. Unfortunately the circumstances of this alleged attack are described in the source in vague, contradictory and probably confused terms, thus throwing serious doubt on Williamson's interpretation.<sup>57</sup>

But Williamson also noted that a particular ship, the *Swallow*, which in October Hawkins had stated was being prepared to go to Guinea but had bonded not to go to the Indies, may have eventually sailed and joined Lovell's fleet of three ships which left England together, making up the four ships off the Cape Verde Islands claimed in Portuguese sources, and then returned singly to England from Guinea (Williamson, Hawkins, 122, 125).<sup>58</sup> Could this ship

<sup>56</sup> In the later sixteenth century, French vessels did regularly visit Guinea and 'Pérou', that is, the Caribbean lands, and therefore most probably did sometimes carry slaves from Africa, but seemingly in the main from Sierra Leone (P.E.H. Hair, 'A note on French and Spanish voyages to Sierra Leone 1550–1585', *History in Africa*, 18 (1991), 137–41). A Portuguese source, written in the early 1590s but often describing the situation in earlier decades back to the 1560s, limited the French export from the Senegal coast to hides and 'ivory, wax, gum, ambergris, musk, gold, and other goods' (Almada, *Tratado Breve*, cap. 2, 18; translation, chap.2/8).

<sup>57</sup> The activities of Lovell's fleet were reported in Articles 18–21 by three testifiers, who all refer to the attacks in February 1567 on four ships off the Cape Verde Islands, in two instances within sight of Santiago Island. But one testifier, Jorge Valasques, begins with the statement that Lovell 'at the end of 1566 and the beginning of 1567 ... in insulam Sancti Jacobi ad oram maritimam guineae in Sierra Lyoa advenisse', that is, 'he came into/at/to Santiago Island to/on the Guinea coast in/at Sierra Leone'. This only makes some sort of sense if it is assumed that an 'and' has dropped out so that it means that Lovell came to Santiago Island and to Sierra Leone. There is, however, no other evidence that Lovell reached Sierra Leone. The official summary of the testifiers' statements adds a new geographical element. Article 18 states that Lovell came 'ad oram maritimam promontorii viridis in Serra Lyoa', that is, 'to the coast of Cape Verde at Sierra Leone'. The injection of 'Cape Verde', which makes no sense in relation to distant 'Sierra Leone', may just possibly owe something to evidence other than that reported in the source, since none of the three testifiers mentions Cape Verde, but is more likely an error, the notary or his clerk intending to represent Santiago Island by the wider term Cape Verde Islands but abbreviating this to 'Cape Verde'. An alternative possibility is that they had in mind the term 'the Guinea of Cape Verde' which, referring to the western coast of Guinea was occasionally taken to include Sierra Leone. To increase the muddle, the summary also interjects that at this uncertain point, perhaps Sierra Leone, Lovell attacked and robbed 'many Portuguese ships'. None of the testifiers supports this statement by specifying, as some always do with other episodes, the individual incidents and ships.

<sup>58</sup> Two of the English captives, Michael Morgan and John Moon, who had sailed with Lovell, each spoke of

*have separated from the fleet, attempted to trade at the cape, and been the single ship accused by the Africans? (The fact that only three Africans were removed and that they appear to have been important individuals suggests that they were either traders or hostages, not slaves, and it is just possible that their carrying away was not deliberate kidnapping.) However, although it is not implausible that the Lovell fleet was off the Guinea coast by 'the end of 1566 and the beginning of 1567', the February 1567 attacks were said to be by four ships, hence the Swallow cannot have been at Cape Verde after separating from the fleet and on its return journey. Perhaps, then, it called at Cape Verde on its outward journey, before reaching the Lovell fleet. Or, alternatively, it made an entirely independent voyage to Guinea, having no connection with Lovell's fleet, and the Portuguese simply miscounted the number of ships in the fleet. Finally, not only can we not fully identify the English ship at Cape Verde, we cannot be sure of what it was doing there and what exactly happened when the Africans were removed.*

*An even greater mystery is the failure of Hawkins to learn from the Fenner episode. Fenner returned to England in June 1567, many months before Hawkins set out; if, on the one hand, news of the African hostility at Cape Verde may have discouraged Hawkins from attempting peaceful trading there, on the other hand, news of the effectiveness of the poisoned arrows should surely have dissuaded him from attempting a slave raid. But Hawkins was not easily discouraged. On the previous voyage, aggressive assaults on African groups at various points had produced vigorous resistance, few captives, and English casualties in perilous situations; yet Hawkins continued to practise slave-raiding, with apparent enthusiasm.*

**(b) Miles Phillips' account (562–3)**

... and holding on our course, upon the eighteenth day of the same moneth we came to an anker upon the coaste of Africa, at cape Verde in twelve fadome water,<sup>59</sup> and here our Generall landed certaine of our men, to the number of 160 or there about, seeking to take some Negroes. And they going up into the countrey for the space of six miles,<sup>60</sup> were incountred with a great number of the Negroes: who with their invenomed arrowes did hurt a great number of our men, so that they were inforced to retyre to the shippes, in which conflict they recovered but a few Negroes, and of these our men which were hurt with their envenomed arrowes, there died to the number of 7. or 8. in very strange maner, with their mouths shut, so that we were forced to put stickes & other things into their mouths to keep them open, and so afterward passing the time upon the coast of Guinea ...

**(c) Job Hortop's account ([4]; 487)**

... and from thense to Cape Verd, where we cast ankor, then we went on shore [tooke our boates, & set souldiers on shore] our Generall being foremost and Captaine Dudley {Our Generall was the first that leapt on land, & with him Captaine Dudley}, there we tooke certaine Negros but [not without damage to our selves. For] our Generall, Captaine Dudley,

---

there having been four ships in Lovell's fleet. Perhaps influenced by this evidence, Williamson's later edition states that 'on November 9, 1566, four ships sailed to Guinea': James A. Williamson, *Hawkins of Plymouth* (London, 1969), 94. But he continues to maintain that the *Swallow* returned separately, although offering no evidence.

<sup>59</sup> This seems impressive knowledge for one who at the time was only a page aboard the ship.

<sup>60</sup> The other accounts do not suggest that the English penetrated so far inland, and the distance seems implausible.



and eight others were hurt with poysoned arrowes, whereof our Generall escaped and by the advise of a Negro cured with a clove of garlick [Our general was taught by a Negro, to draw the poyson out of his wound with a clove of garlike, whereby he was cured],<sup>61</sup> but Captaine Dudley and the other eight died {about nine dayes after, the 8. that were wounded died}, from thence to Surroleon ...

*In his revised account, Hortop omits the inaccurate statement about the death of Dudley at this stage of the voyage, and instead inserts a reference to Dudley's participation in the later River Cacheu foray, and to his death at an even later stage, as the fleet was crossing the Atlantic. This brought Hortop's account into line with the Cotton MS account, where Dudley is named in connection with the River Cacheu foray. But it is worth noting that, since Dudley was nowhere mentioned in the two printed accounts available in 1591, Hortop or his editor was not influenced in making this change by reading these.*

**(d) The Cotton MS account (ff.22v–23v)**

Abowte the 26<sup>th</sup> of November<sup>62</sup> we arived at Cabo Verde in Guynea where oure generall determynd, beinge as it was the firste place that we came unto of negros, a place where the negros that come owte thence are best solde in the India of any other,<sup>63</sup> to goe along with 200 menne and to take as many of them as he might. The next morning, after we came to anker harde by the Cape ij howers before it was daye, oure generall, meaning, if it wolde have bene, to take the negros sleping, went him self ashore and with him the said 200 menne, but he was no soner ashore but the negros perceaved it and lefte their howses [?...//] and greate villan [?...] of Cabo Verde to Inglish m[en ?...] alsoe divers other howses and [?...]d therin howses and all other thinges [...] took to the number of 9 negros, menne, w[omen and children. At the] break of daye the negros which fledde from [the houses gathered the]m selves together and here and there at a sodda[in onset str]oke oure menne with their invenimed arrowes, [being to the nu]mber of 600 or therabowte. When oure menne wolde [turn on them the]y wolde fly and escape by swyftenes of foot.[Neverthel]esse there were many of them slaine with [arquebus shot] and abowte 20 of oure menne hurte with the arro[wes ?...]. And oure generall was shott in the lefte Arme. Th[e wounds] which oure menne receaved then were thoughte noth[ing at the] beginning, for the point of the arrowes made [in the place] they strook to the semeing of a pinnes heade, and oure m[en that] were hurt semed to make a

<sup>61</sup> A Portuguese account says that Jolof soldiers carried with them an antidote to the poison, and also that the poison could be sucked out from the wound (provided that the those sucking 'have no connection with women while carrying out the cure') (Almada, *Tratado Breve*, cap. 2, 13; translation Chap.2/19). If, as the Cotton MS account states, the effect of the poison was felt only after a few days, it is curious that Hawkins was treated in time. And if within a few days after being struck, curious that the same cure was not offered to the other victims. The Cotton MS account, in a damaged section, does not mention Hawkins as being one of those struck by the arrows, and the damage gap seems hardly large enough to have contained such an important reference. If Hortop's story was true, presumably the obliging 'Negro' originated from Senegal but was perhaps one of the interpreters brought from England.

<sup>62</sup> This date cannot be correct, since the fleet reached River Cacheu on 29 November. Perhaps a misreading of 20 November.

<sup>63</sup> The Africans of this region around Cape Verde, the Jolof, were the earliest to provide numbers of slaves for America, and one individual apparently taken from this region, to judge by his name, Juan Gelofe, gave evidence in Mexico against an English captive. But that, as late as the 1560s, the slaves from this region retained a reputation as the 'best', that is, the most expensive, is less certain.

laughter thereat.<sup>64</sup> But [*before ij*] dayes were passed there was sene amongst vs the [*strangest*] manner of deathe that ever any manne had sene to f[*ore*]. The poyson, thowghe all was donne possible to the contrary, so wroughte that those that the arrowes had perced in the legge and other places of litle daunger, but the verry skinne, within the said ij dayes dyed after such a sorte that it amased all the companye. The strengths of the poyson was suche that it cawsed their jawes to shutt, the which when they did, there wolde come up into their throtes suche abundance of corruption after the manner of fleame that it wolde stoppe their breath. Those menne them selves wolde open their mowthes with a wedg and, after the said corruption was cleared owte, taulk as hartely as they had no hurte, but neverthelesse all wolde not serve, for as many as the poyson shutt their [...//] hardly escaped [...] and the arrowe brake [...] splinters therein the seconde daye a [... *seeing that*] we cowlde doe no god, oure generall com[*aunded us to come aboard again*]. Thus we sette sayle thence alongest [*the coast and* [...]] fell over borde and was drowned, a greate misfortune [*to us*].

### (e) Evidence of the English captives

... speaking with the inhabitants of the country he [*sc.* Hawkins] learned of the presence in the vicinity of six French pirate vessels and that there was no prospect of bartering for negroes, for which reason he seized half a dozen he fell in with, without paying or giving anything for them. (John Carvell or Varney, gentleman adventurer)

... asked whether there were Spaniards or Portuguese living at this Cape Verde, he says none ... (Gregory Stevens, trader)

... the general landed by night with a party of soldiers in military formation. He does not know how many they were, for it was night. They went to take negroes and had an encounter with certain negroes in which he took seven or eight and killed others. He does not know how many, and they burned most of the negroes' houses they found there. The negroes wounded and killed more than 25 Englishmen ... (Robert Barrett, master of the flagship)

Thence they sailed to a cape, which was said to be Cape Verde, inhabited by negroes. The said general with one hundred men landed and burned as much of the village as he could, taking eight prisoners and killing several others; the deponent does not know how many there were, because it was night, and the said negroes wounded eleven Englishmen, who later died. (Valentine Green, trader)

... went to a negro village where they captured eleven negroes, seven of whom were taken to the flagship and four set at liberty as they were thin and old. (Michael Sole, gentleman adventurer, confirmed by Richard Temple, gentleman adventurer)

... [Hawkins] landed and was given a cow for which he paid: he anchored there for two or three days, doing no harm to any one. (William Sanders, soldier)

... John Hawkins' men did not fire guns or arquebuses or anything else, nor did they do any damage ... (Henry Morris, ship's boy/page)

*The captives testified that no Spanish or Portuguese were involved in the operation at Cape Verde, and the Spanish authorities accepted this. A few of the captives lied about the attack on the African village, but most realised that the Spaniards were not concerned about the*

<sup>64</sup> The use of small arrows which only pricked the skin in order to insert poison, explains the protection worn by Jolof soldiers, layers of cloth wrapped round the body or cotton-padded garments (Almada, *Tratado Breve*, cap.1, 12; translation chap.1/17; Donelha, *Descrição*, 128).

*episode. The statement that Hawkins first inquired about trading for slaves was almost certainly untrue. There was general agreement that seven or eight Africans were carried away, and that about a dozen Englishmen died of their wounds. The number of English involved was most often given as 100. The ill success of the English slave-raid, almost a total disaster, stemmed from ignorance of Guinea and its peoples, particularly those of Senegambia, and in general of the technique of slaving.*

*The poisoned arrows of the African peoples to the north and south of Cape Verde had been known to the Portuguese, and consequently respected by them, for over a century. In 1445, immediately south of Cape Verde, a boatload of Portuguese explorers was shot at as it approached the shore, and several Portuguese died. Again, in 1463, Cadamosto described how a chief north of Cape Verde poisoned his arrows with a mixture of snake venom and seeds from a certain tree; and he said of the arrows employed by the peoples south of Cape Verde that if they touched the bare skin and drew blood, 'subito la creatura e morta'.<sup>65</sup> Since Cadamosto's account was available in print (albeit not yet in English), the English were not only inexperienced in slaving but had not done their homework. However, as cited above, in Sparke's account of Hawkins' previous voyage, it was asserted that 'the people of Cape Verde ... are more civil then any other... and are of nature very gentle and loving'. Possibly the people discussed by Sparke were not the same as the people raided in 1567. But it is equally possible that the same people were civil when traded with, and warlike when brutally and treacherously attacked — or else when they had a grievance about the removal of compatriots. The commercial moral of this episode was clear: direct slave-raiding by Europeans on African communities did not pay. The Europeans needed to have African trading partners, who in some instances raided for them or on their own account, and who, having obtained slaves by fair means or foul, then sold them to the Europeans. The Portuguese had of course known this for a long time. It cannot, however, be said that Hawkins had learned his lesson, since other slave raids were made later in the voyage.*

---

<sup>65</sup> Diogo Gomes, *De la découverte de la Guinée* (Bissau, 1959), f.274; *Viagens de Luís de Cadamosto e de Pedro de Sintra* (Lisbon, 1948), 43, 53.

## 5. PAST CAPE VERDE (ABOUT 20 NOVEMBER 1567)

### (a) Job Hortop's revised account (487)

... to Cape Verde. In our course thither we met a Frenchman of Rochel called capitaine Bland, who had taken a Portugal caravel, whom our vice admiral chased and tooke. Capitaine Drake, now Sir Francis Drake was made master & capitaine of the Caravel,<sup>66</sup> and so we kept our way till we came to Cape Verde ...

*Hortop's first version does not mention this episode, but since it also does not appear in the accounts printed before 1591, Hortop cannot have borrowed it from these. In fact, though Hortop was in error in one important detail — in locating the encounter with the French ships before rather than after the landing at Cape Verde — his account in general agrees with the evidence presented below. This is the first of several passages in the revised version where Hortop inserts complimentary references to Drake — who was not named in the original. Other comments on this extract appear below.*

### (b) The Cotton MS account (f.23v)

... nexte daye betymes we had sight of 6 sayles [*who when*] they saw, being before at an anker with[in] a league [*of us, they w*]ayed and sett sayle and bare owte into the sea. [*Oure generall*] comaunded to make after them to know what they [*were. When*] we came neare them we understood they were [*Frenchmen*] whoe there did trafik with the negros of the [*coast for*] hides and other thinges. Oure generall cawsed them [*to stay while*] he tauked with the chiefe of them, of whom [*he bought diver*]s necessaryes for oure vioadge and paide them therefor. [*And*] among these saide ships he fownde j which was one [*of those*] that had made the spoyle at Cabo Blanco among the [*Portugals*], the which had no wares in her but soldiers, and the [*ship her*]selfe was no French shippe, but one that the French[*men*] had taken from the Portugalls. Oure generall took her [*and her*] capitaine, [*and*] all her menne to goe with him in the vioadge.<sup>67</sup> Thus the nexte daye after we ankered there we wayed again to depart alongest on oure vioadge. When we were readye to sette sayle, nowe beinge 8 sayles with the Portugall barck that the Frenche menne had taken, one of the Frenche ships which had divers wares as iron and others sente her boate aborde oure generall and offered their servyce to oure generall in the vioadge and to do as oure company & ships did. Oure gencrall tolde them that if they wolde he was verry well content. Uppon this the boat departed, and we sette sayle, and the French manne wayed and sett sayle with us, so that nowe we were 9 sayles in all. Thus we departed all together towardes Cabo Roxo ...

### (c) Evidence of the English captives (and a French captive)

*Williamson's account of this episode (Hawkins, 151–2) is not entirely correct. The Spanish authorities interrogated the captives at length on the episode, since two of the French ships*

---

<sup>66</sup> Although this appears to be confirmed by a statement of one of the captives, it is elsewhere recorded that Drake (whose early history is obscure) commanded the *Judith* at both the beginning of the voyage and after the Mexican episode. That in between he commanded a captured vessel, although seemingly a somewhat larger vessel than the *Judith*, is perhaps doubtful.

<sup>67</sup> In the Caribbean, 'oure generall dischargd one of the French [*ships*] owte of his servyce, that which they had taken from the [*Portu*]gall and he browghte with him from Cabo Verde ... But the other French shippe which was the bigger and came with us from Cabo Verde willinglye kept with us company still' (Cotton MS account, f. 38v).

*accompanied the English fleet across the Atlantic and one was captured at San Juan de Ulúa, with its French crew. The English agreed that six French vessels were met between Cape Verde and Cabo Roxo, but most probably not far south of the former cape, at one of the ports of the 'Little Coast' of Senegal. According to a French sailor who was captured at San Juan, one French ship was from Harfleur and belonged to Captain Jean Planes (Captain 'Bland' of La Rochelle, according to Hortop). The French vessels were trading. The 'dailie traffike with the Frenchmen' of the peoples around Cape Verde had been noted in the account of Hawkins' 1564 voyage (above).*

*As the English fleet approached, the French ships took alarm and one, several, or all of them — the evidence varies — attempted to escape. But the English rounded up the French ships and inspected them, to see if they were carrying trade goods. Five produced documentary evidence certifying that they were peaceful traders, which the English accepted. But the sixth had no trade goods and no papers and was arrested. The English accused the master and crew of being responsible for the attack on the Portuguese ships at Cap Blanc, and one witness even asserted that Hawkins was acting partly in response to a request from Pedro da Ponte, the Spanish trader of the Canaries, who had asked the English to be on the look-out for French pirates who had recently raided those islands. Apart from having no papers, various other proofs of the guilt of the French ship were alleged: these proofs are perhaps not altogether convincing. Hortop and the Cotton MS account assert that the ship itself had been stolen from the Portuguese at Cap Blanc, which may well have been the case, although the evidence of the captives on this point is vague and ambiguous. With the other five French ships, the English fleet traded — 'almonds, figs and supplies, for linen and pewterware' — and one French vessel attached itself, allegedly voluntarily, to the fleet. This was said to be Captain Planes' ship, contradicting the assertion of Hortop that Captain 'Bland' was the master of the arrested vessel. There appears to be confirmation that Drake was given charge of the captured ship (but see note 66 above). Thus the English subverted the Spanish charge that Hawkins was a pirate by presenting him as a capturer of pirates.*

Before they reached Cabo Rojo, in sight of Cape Verde, they came upon six French vessels which were anchored on the coast, trading with the negroes, which vessels surrendered to the general. He found that one of them had no merchandise with which to trade and he took the captain and crew who were aboard and carried them and their ship along with him; and another ship, because it was doing no business, inasmuch as there were six ships trading, spoke to John Hawkins and came along with him on his adventure on equal terms. He left the rest anchored on the coast, trading, ... (Robert Barrett, master of the flagship)

... finding that one of them was a pirate as it did not carry any letter of marque, he made the captain and the crew prisoners, while another vessel voluntarily decided to accompany them ... (Valentine Green, trader, confirmed Michael Sole, gentleman adventurer)

... they went from there to Cabo Rojo where they met four French ships and a Portuguese caravel with many Frenchmen in it, and the general seized them all. From the caravel and the five (sic) ships he took cider, almonds, figs and other provisions, paying for them in linen and pewterware, and he left the five ships. When they were sailing away, one of the ships sailed and came to the fleet and its captain said that he wished to accompany the fleet on its adventures, and the general permitted him to come with us ... (Gregory Stevens, trader)

... went in search of Cape Verde and near the port found to windward six French vessels, and John Hawkins seized them, although the French had two or three guns to defend themselves.

The masters of four ships showed Hawkins certificates that they were dealing and trading in the ports and proceeding peacefully, so he left them, and the other two he took, and he anchored in the port and some men landed at Cape Verde ... (William Sanders, soldier)

... they reached Cabo La Vela, where they found seven thieving French ships. Five showed to John Hawkins licences from the Admiral of France to rob at sea, one ship belonging to the Admiral, the rest to individual pirates. The other two ships, because they showed no licence from the Admiral, John Hawkins seized and brought with him. And there they learned from a Portuguese youth that the French ships had robbed a Portuguese vessel and hanged the Portuguese aboard ... (William Collins, sailor)<sup>68</sup>

... bartering and giving the negroes ironware and other articles in exchange for cow hides ... the French ship was a pirate ... (Noah Sargeant, sailor)

... one French ship tried to escape ... suspected this of being the ship which attacked the Portuguese caravels ... on board a quantity of almonds which must have been taken from the Portuguese caravel seized ... the crew of the French ship were transferred to his ship and a crew of ten to twelve Englishmen put aboard the French ship ... (Richard Temple, gentleman adventurer)

... because when they were in the Canary Islands the people there had complained to them that certain Frenchmen had stolen much merchandise, John Hawkins searched the vessels ... took one ship which contained no merchandise and carried twenty-six men, which convinced them that it was a pirate ship ... (William Holland, gentleman adventurer)

... Pedro da Ponte had asked John Hawkins to round up the French ships ... (Roger Beit or Armer, armourer)

... embarked at Harfleur ... the ship called *Holy Ghost* belonging to Jean Planes<sup>69</sup> ... his ship was not the one that robbed the caravel but the men in the other ship ... the two ships had fifty Frenchmen ... (Roldan Escalart, French sailor)

... to produce documents from officials of the French ports ... a ship under Captain Planes joined them ... (Antony Goddard, trader)

... was on the French ship ... Francis Drake conducted Sunday services ... (Thomas Goodall, sailor/soldier)

---

<sup>68</sup> Jiménez Rueda, *Corsarios*, 407. 'Cabo de la Vela' in Venezuela, near Rio de la Hacha, was noted on the 1567-1568 voyage (Hakluyt 1589, 553), but there is no record of a cape with that name in Guinea. It may have been an erroneous reference to Cape Verde. But precisely where the French ships might have been expected to be found, while trading on the 'Little Coast' of Senegal, was 'Cabo dos Mastos' (now Cap de Naze). Had Collins misremembered 'sail' (*vela*) for 'masts' (*mastos*)?

<sup>69</sup> The former Portuguese caravel became known to the English as the *Grace of God*, which may have been a translation of *Gratia Dei* or the Portuguese equivalent. When claiming compensation for its loss, Hawkins referred to it not only as a new ship, of about 150 tons (perhaps an exaggeration to increase its value), but, misleadingly if not deceitfully, as 'of the said Company's adventure' (Arber, *English Garner*, 5: 119). Williamson, following Hortop, makes Bland/Planes the master of this arrested ship rather than of the voluntary ship (*Hawkins*, 151).

## 6. APPROACHING CAPE ROXO

(22 (?) NOVEMBER 1567)

### (a) The printed accounts

*The public account and the accounts by Miles Phillips and Job Hortop all omit mention of the following minor episodes. The abstract log of the voyage states that on 24 December the fleet reached 'Cape Roxo alias St. Domingos' (Williamson, Hawkins, 152), the latter another name for the nearby River Cacheu but here applied to the cape which precedes the river on the coast to the north.*

### (b) The Cotton MS account (ff.23v–24)

Thus we departed all together towardses Cabo Roxo, where in the way being calmed our generall sente oure boates ashore 8 leagues to the northward of Cabo Roxo, where with margaritas and other wares which the negros esteme they enticed the negros to come to them and to feche them water, and at the lyke oure menne, thinking to sette vppon them to take them, they dowbted and fledde even as oure menne pretended to doe their feat. [?...//] abowt [?...]re to her and cawse [?...] barck [*being*] a Portugall of the Ilond of Cabo Verde, had divers thinges in [*her, some of which*] oure generall bowghte and gave [*them wares in recompence*]. By this barcke oure generall vnder[*stood that in the river*] of Rio Grande there were many [*other caravels of the*] Portingalls that make<sup>70</sup> theire negros to the [*West Indies, who*] towche here before they goe hence and [*take with them divers*] necessaryes hence.<sup>71</sup>

*This damaged passage can fortunately be completed from the evidence of the captives. The landing to capture Africans probably took place on the coast between River Gambia and River Casamance.*

### (c) Evidence of the English captives

They sailed to Cabo Rojo, also peopled by negroes, to trade with the Portuguese, who were unwilling to deal with them ... (Robert Barrett, master of the flagship)

... to another land of negroes where they found nobody ... (Richard Reed, cooper)

... to another place inhabited by negroes but these on seeing them took fright and fled ... (Noah Sargeant, sailor)

Thence they went to Cabo Rojo, a village of negroes, and next to the Rio Grande to traffic with the Portuguese ... they saw a sail, which turned out to be a Portuguese ship from the islands of Cape Verde: the general bought from this ship some cauldrons and chick peas and paid in cloth ... (Valentine Green, trader)

... on the way they saw a little caravel approaching but they did not go to it and did nothing about it ... (William Sanders, soldier)

*The landing to capture Africans did not interest the Spanish authorities and most of the captives did not mention it in their evidence. Barrett's evidence seems garbled but it also served to conceal the next episode in which Barrett was much involved, the activity in River Cacheu. Many of the interrogated captives, linking Cape Roxo with River Cacheu and similarly wishing to conceal the activity in that river, in their evidence jumped from Cape*

---

<sup>70</sup> Misreading for 'take'?

<sup>71</sup> It was correct that Portuguese ships loaded slaves for America in what the English were calling 'Rio Grande', that is, River Cacheu (originally spelled 'Cacheo', e.g., in the 'book of complaints').

*Verde to Sierra Leone. The stopping of a small Portuguese vessel, apparently near Cape Roxo, as it was proceeding towards River Cacheu, was referred to only by Valentine Green among the captives, his evidence again closely resembling that in the Cotton MS account. It is possible that the English obtained information about the shipping likely to be found in River Cacheu from the occupants of the little ship, but unlikely (as argued in the next section) that they used one of them to pilot English vessels into the river, even though it had a notoriously difficult entrance, and though, as far as we know, it had never before been visited by English ships.*



## 7. IN RIVER CACHEU

### (29 NOVEMBER – 3 (?) DECEMBER 1567)

#### (a) The public account (553)

... From thence we past the tyme uppon the coast of Guinea searching with all diligence the rivers from rio graunde, unto the Searliona [Sierra Leona]...

*A deceitfully laconic statement, concealing an attack on a Portuguese base. The abstract log of the voyage jumps from 24 November, when the fleet reached Cape Roxo to 14 December when 'we saw the Idolos [Iles de Los]' (Williamson, Hawkins, 152). In 1564, Hawkins had not known 'how to goe into Rio Grande, for want of a Pilot',<sup>72</sup> and there is no evidence that in 1567 he penetrated the real Rio Grande, i.e. the River Jeba estuary (Williamson, 154, is wrong on this point). In fact, the English confused Rio Grande with 'Rio São Domingos' — in this present edition given its later name of River Cacheu — the river previous to River Jeba.<sup>73</sup> In 1564 Hawkins landed on the Bissagos Islands, more or less at the mouth of Rio Grande, which suggests that on this occasion he had it in mind to search for the entrance to River Jeba. But there would have been little to gain by entering this river. In 1567, presumably because by now he had better knowledge, he sent ships into River Cacheu, where there was a Portuguese commercial base, to trade with or attack. But since the English thought this was Rio Grande, it is unlikely that they had a Portuguese or local-African pilot, because such an individual would surely have supplied the correct name. The Cotton MS account, Hortop, and several of the English captives who mention the river also call it Rio Grande, but other captives correctly refer to the 'Santo Domingo' — it is just possible that they learned the correct name when in Mexico, from their interrogators or conceivably from better-informed non-English fellow prisoners, and then shared the knowledge.*

#### (b) Miles Phillips' account (563)

... & so afterwards passing the time upon the coast of Guinea, until the twelfth of Januarie, wee obtained by that time the number of 150. Negroes.

*Like the public account, Miles Phillips' account fails to mention the significant events in River Cacheu. It seems likely that Phillips, writing after his return to England in 1582, was encouraged to omit reference to the episode, but just possible that, instead, a reference was excised by Hakluyt when he published the account in 1589. However, Job Hortop referred to the attack in his 1591 publications, and Hortop's revised version appeared in Hakluyt's second edition. Thus the 1590s, by publicly revealing the attack, showed up the discretion of the earlier printed accounts.*

#### (c) Job Hortop's account ([5]–[6]; 488)

... we past to the river of Reogrand, where we went in with some of our ships & pinnases {and made reday sayle towards Rio grande, At our comming thither} we entred with the Angel, the Judith, and the 2 pinnesses, there we met with seven Carvels with whom we fought a long time {seven Portugal Carvells, which made great fight with us}, & in the end we had the victorie {by Gods helpe wee wonne the victory, and drove them to the shore, from whence with the Negroes they fled}, we tooke the Carvels & brought them into the river {we

---

<sup>72</sup> Hakluyt 1589, 526.

<sup>73</sup> An outside possibility is this: that from a map showing the whole Guinea coast, they read River São Domingos as part of the complex of streams entering the 'Rio Grande' estuary.

fecht the carvels from the shore into the river} where the rest of our fleete met us, & after fought with fifteene thousand Negroes, & slew many of them {The next morning M. Francis Drake with his carvel, the Swallow, and the William and John came into the river, with captaine Dudley and his souldiers, who landed being but a hundred souldiers, and fought with seven thousand<sup>74</sup> Negroes}, burning a towne of theirs, & having lost one man we retourned to our General.

... At this place called Reogrande uppon the lande there are many muske cats which do breede in hollowe trees, which the Negroes do finde out, first they finde out their haunt and catch them with a net, they nourish them daintily, putting them in cages, and take the muske very charily from them with a spoone or such like.

*Hortop forgot the sequence of the voyage and put the assault on the Portuguese base 'after we went from Surrealeon'. This in itself tended to obscure the significance of the reference, and no doubt by 1600, after a war with Spain-cum-Portugal, an unprovoked assault on the shipping and a shore base of a 'friendly' power in peacetime thirty years earlier seemed less heinous — hence Hakluyt's allowing it to be included. According to official Portuguese complaints, the town burnt was Cacheu, some fifteen miles up River Cacheu and about thirty miles from Cape Roxo. Although essentially a settlement of Africans, with a small number of Portuguese traders living in a suburb, and although the royal officials regulating aspects of the trade had their headquarters further up-river, at Buguendo, the port of Cacheu was the main base for Portuguese commercial activities on the mainland of western Guinea. Judging by the accounts that follow, Hortop exaggerated the number of Africans participating in the affray. The digression on musk cats, like later digressions on hippopotamus and elephants, helped to justify part of the sub-title of Hortop's book, 'also he discovereth ... sundrie monstrous beasts'.<sup>75</sup>*

#### **(d) The Cotton MS account (ff.24–25v)**

Oure generall, to se wh[at might here be] done sente in to the river a barcke and [certain pinnaces armed] thorowghlye in company with this Portugall, [and when our] menne came up into the river they found [certain Portugal] carvayls besides other small vessels whoe d[id, being] full of ordenaunce of brasse, shott at oure ba[rck and boats] all that they might. The master of the Jhesus, Ro[bert Barrett, knowing] the King of Portugall bath comaunded under penalties that his subiectes [trade not and that] he here had the governments by oure general[l given him for] the semelye entertaynment, proved yet by so[me fair speech] to pacifyc the angrye Portugals, declaring that he [was sent] thether by his generall the worshipfull Master John [Hawkins] esquyre to trafique with them wares for negros and [to no] other intent. The Portingals wolde not awnswere a wo[rde], but plyed theire ordenaunce, the which were brasse bases that shotte good, demi colveringes, sakers, mynions and suche like shott. When the master sawe that they mente to sinke the barck if they could, seying that wordes booted not he cheered his menne and boarded the saide carvers with the barck and pinaces. The Portinga[ls], seying that oure menne feared not to enter uppon their shott, never defended theire carvers but fledde all alonde, being more, twyse more, in number then oure menne. The best pece of ordenaunce that oure barck had was a fawconet, and but 40 menne in

<sup>74</sup> Revised from 15,000! Hortop not uncommonly presents greatly exaggerated numbers. When the English lost fewer than 100 killed at San Juan de Ulúa, Hortop put Spanish casualties at 540 (Hakluyt 1598, 3: 490).

<sup>75</sup> Cf. 'here there are many civet cats' (Valentim Fernandes, *Description de la côte occidentale d'Afrique* (1506–1510) (Bissau, 1951), f.120).

all the barck and pinaces. When oure menne had seased uppon the carvayls the master sente to the Portingals & desired them to come to theire ships againe, for he wolde not minish any thinge they had, nor hurt any manne. This he had done was for [?...//] barck [?...] in this river of [?...] taken there were of the ships and Portugals [?...] enter in all haste into the r[iver ?...] chardge to make all strong what so ev[er ?...] The master tarryed there to se, and thowg[h ?...] trafique while these barckes and menne of [?...] on to the river. The Portingals had come [with false words to] the master, promysing him trafique, for seing [his small numbers], it was but to dally with him till they had [gathered] thether abowte 6000 negros at the leaste, all [well armed], and then they beganne both to denye theire [promises] and alsoe to use oprobrious woordes. The master seying [this, our gen]erall comaunding him to the contrarye at his [departure], he having auctoritye above any there uppon the [place, when our] menne and barckes were come, wente ashore well [armed] with 240 menne, mynding to spoyle a towne which [was about] a myle from the water side where oure shippes did [lie, to see] if he cowlde take any negros there. The [Porting]als when they sawe this suffered oure menne to [come] allmost to the towne quyetye, but when they sawe [that] oure menne were nowe a greate waye from oure boates they gave a watch worde to the negros whoe laye embosked, and suddainlye there were in the fieldes, besides the Portugals which might be abowt 100, above 6000 negros.<sup>76</sup> [Some] of oure menne had entered the towne and sette certaine howses afyre, but they retyred seyng so great a number of ennemeys, and joyned together. The Portugals nowe encoraged the negros to sette upon oure menne, the which the negros did with great bates and hachets, dartes and invenimed arrowes,<sup>77</sup> and fowght at hand strookes. The fight was cruell and 4 of oure menne were slaine by and by, and many of oure menne hurt, and thowghe many of the negros were slaine and hurt, yet they so pressed one of oure menne that oure menne beganne to geve grownd, for the negros wold ronne uppon the hargabuz withowte feare. When the Portugals sawe oure menne beginne to retyre they by and by [?...//] Master Edwarde Du[dley ?...]<sup>78</sup> dowbting at the firste [?...] way betweene the water syde [?...] oure menne in such neade and every [?...]ht, he issued owte when he had [?...] he saw of the negros and spedde every [?...] This so astonished the negros that, dowbtinge [our men's force was] suche betwene that and the water side, th[ey forbore to come on] any further, and thus oure menne came to the [water side to] their boates. And to se the stowtness of this [barbarous negro] people, as oure menne were putting of one of the boates, [a certain] negro lepte into the water and perforce plucked [an oar out] of oure mennes handes, and thowghe one of oure menne [shot him so] into the bodye that the arrowe went cleane thor[owgh him, he] caryed the oare and rann with it abowte 40 [paces and then] fell downe dead. Oure menne thus went abo[ard and the] master sente worde owte to oure generall what had happened [and that] there was no good to be done there. Oure generall when [he heard] this was sore displeased for the yll order and that the [master] after such a sorte put so many menne in jepardy. Oure [general] wolde not that he shoulde have had to doe with them

<sup>76</sup> Both figures are probably exaggerated. The number of Portuguese may have been nearer 50 (in view of the few small vessels and the unlikelihood of their run-away crews joining in a battle, as well as of the few Portuguese likely to have been resident on land). The number of African fighting men swiftly assembled was probably only in the higher hundreds, or at best, in the lower thousands.

<sup>77</sup> Unlike the inhabitants of the Cape Verde district, the inhabitants of the River Cacheu district were not renowned for poisoned weapons, and the English accounts do not specify that any men died from this cause.

<sup>78</sup> We may guess that Dudley led a group of soldiers which cleared the way to the boats for the party retiring from the town.

a[land], but that he shoulde have gone up the river and there have seased uppon the ships that were there, where alsoe the King of Portugal's factor was,<sup>79</sup> and at his handes there mighte trafique have bene had soner then any other wayes. But oure generall, seyng the tyme lost, determyned to go into the river him selfe in his ship called the William and John, and proving to goe over the barre cowlde not fynde water inowghe for her to passe over. Therefore, bycause he wold not lose more tyme, he sente in to the master and comaunded him to come awaye and to bring 2 or 3 of the carvayls owte with him, seyng the Portugals wolde not come abourd them, and thereby they shoulde be gladde to come owte and trafique with him where he ridde withowte the barre to have theire ships againe. Thus we ridde withowte, and the vessels aforesaid were browghte owte, but the Portugals wolde not come, therefore bycause oure generall wo[ld] not delay the tyme he toke the saide carvayls with him alongest, meaning to [?...///]

*Although the information received from the Portuguese from the Cape Verde Islands was stated in the text to refer to 'Rio Grande', the port visited by Portuguese slavers on the way to America was Cacheu.<sup>80</sup> In the 1580s, the Portuguese were to build a fort along River Cacheu, at the port of Cacheu, 'to prevent the entry of the English and the French and stop them from taking our ships as they did previously'.<sup>81</sup> In fact, no pre-1580s enemy attack into River Cacheu other than that of the English in 1568 is known. Hawkins' larger ships lay off the bar, or perhaps as far back as near Cape Roxo, the entrance to the river being a difficult one because of sandbanks and shifting channels. The smaller ships discovered Portuguese vessels in the port of Cacheu, and captured them. Apparently this was followed by a truce during which each side brought up reinforcements. It is notable that the Portuguese were able to involve African allies. At a later date, in order to be free from the demands of the king of Cacheu, the Portuguese built at the river a separate township for themselves and their dependents, and this led to clashes with the local Africans.<sup>82</sup> The English rashly attempted to assault the town of Cacheu, but were ambushed and repulsed, after setting fire to part of the town. They thus failed either to buy slaves from the Portuguese or to capture them by warfare.*

*The account lays the responsibility for the fiasco on Robert Barrett, master at the Jesus. Since Barrett was alive and still in command of the flagship when the account breaks off, this is strange. It may indicate that the account was written, or at least that this section was edited, at a later date, when Barrett was a prisoner of the Spaniards, or even later, after his execution in Spain (in ?1572). Be that as it may, Hawkins, on the other hand, is made out never to have intended hostilities towards the Portuguese; yet it may be suspected that he deliberately failed to accompany this important foray so that if a clash with the Portuguese resulted — as was highly likely — he, as leader of the expedition, could disclaim*

<sup>79</sup> The reference is to the port known as Buguendo, up a creek on the north side of River Cacheu, and it was correct that, at that date, the crown agents were located there. Buguendo had served since c.1500 for the export of wax and cotton from the lands to the north and east, but Cacheu, on the open river, became more important with the development of the export of slaves, particularly when this involved the larger ships of the trans-Atlantic trade.

<sup>80</sup> Bissau on the Rio Grande/Jeba was not yet an important Portuguese centre, and the Portuguese settlements on River Balola (which was entered from the Jeba estuary) were of limited importance.

<sup>81</sup> Almada, *Tratado Breve*, cap.9, 45; translation chap.9/2.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid.

*responsibility and accuse a subordinate of disobeying orders. In fact, Hawkins must have approved the sending into the river of a large party of soldiers to back up Barrett, and therefore his criticism of his subordinate can only have related to the English allowing themselves to be ambushed. That Barrett should have attacked Buguendo rather than Cacheu sounds like unrealistic second thoughts. Access to Buguendo was up a creek and would probably have required a pilot, while if the object of the exercise was solely to acquire slaves, more slaves were likely to be congregated in the port of Cacheu than at Buguendo.*

### **(e) Evidence of the English captives**

*The Spanish civil authorities and later the Inquisitors realised that this episode provided them with some of the clearest evidence of English misdemeanour. The captives realised this too, and endeavoured to maintain a conspiracy of silence. Many tried to omit any mention of the episode, while some lied about the nature of the contact with the Portuguese. Nevertheless, a few provided interesting details further to those in the Cotton MS account.*

... anchored off the port of Santo Domingo, as the port was small the larger vessels remained outside, only the vessel on which declarant served entering: he remained on board and did not observe whether this crew or other crews went ashore, nor whether they brought back anything. They were at anchor 3-4 days without doing any harm to anyone. (Noah Sargeant, sailor)

*The vessel mentioned was the caravel seized at Cap Blanc: the last phrase was the standard answer to the Spaniards' interrogation.*

... thence the fleet sailed to a port of Guinea called Santo Domingo into which two of the smaller ships entered and obtained fifty negroes in exchange for cloths and combs and other merchandise and four days later proceeded ... (Christopher Robinson, gunner)

... in the said Rio Grande there were some Portuguese with whom they had no trouble. At that place the said captain acquired by barter and purchase a number of negroes ... (John Hall, cooper, the first part repeated by Michael Sole, gentleman adventurer)

... they went to Santo Domingo river and took a canoe with three negroes who were fishing ... (William Holland, gentleman adventurer)

... anchored in port, but did not enter the town or do anything except that the people of the small ship took a man, a woman and a boy, all negroes. (William Sanders, soldier)

... Santo Domingo, where the people were unwilling to give them slaves ... (Thomas Fowler, gentleman adventurer)

... river called Santo Domingo where they remained two or three days without doing anything ... (Christopher Bingham, gentleman adventurer)

*No captive mentioned both the Rio Grande and the Rio São Domingos, which confirms that the English confused the names and visited only one river. None of the captives appears to have admitted to the civil authorities that the fleet had not only entered a river which was indubitably under Portuguese 'protection' but had actually fought with, and presumably killed, Portuguese subjects and native allies. But before the Inquisition a few years later, some of the English told a fuller story — although the Inquisitors were most shocked by a plausible detail, that the English heretics disrespected the crucifixes and religious statues on the Portuguese ships and houses.*

... sailed for Guinea ... found no negroes because the Portuguese had concealed them, and John Hawkins leaped on shore by the upper river and captured some Portuguese, torturing six of them with ropes until they confessed that the negroes were concealed in a ravine, and each of the six offered fifty negroes: who gave them in return some merchandise in the shape of tinware and other things of little value ... Before leaving that port the soldiers returned into the caravels and ships lying in the said port which form the dwellings of the Portuguese because on shore they have no permanent houses, and took all the images and crosses they could find and threw them into the sea ... [one man] took an image of the Lamb of the Holy Ghost, with its flag and cross and book, being the representation of St John the Baptist, and concealed it and took it to the flagship and put it in his trunk, and there it was found when they disembarked at San Juan de Ulúa; also he took an axe and smashed a cross that the Portuguese had to mark their burials ashore. (William Collins, sailor)<sup>83</sup>

*Collins was answering questions five years after the event, and some confusion in the details may have been the result of mere forgetfulness. But it is also possible that he was endeavouring to tell the Inquisitors what he thought they wanted to hear. The above details undoubtedly refer to River Cacheu, although this is unnamed, where it is plausible that along the riverside some of the Portuguese had no European-style houses and either lived in huts or in their ships. On the destruction of crucifixes and 'images', a standard accusation against 'Lutherites' when captured, see note 49 above. The torturing of certain Portuguese merchants who refused to trade is almost plausible, but with one exception all other evidence contradicts the personal involvement of Hawkins, who stayed aboard the large vessels outside the river. The exception is the evidence of George Reaveley before the Inquisitors, to the effect that he remembered having seen John Hawkins put ropes around the necks of the Portuguese to make them tell him where the negroes were. But probably Collins and Reaveley were at one stage fellow-prisoners and most likely 'remembered' this detail while jointly preparing their story. (It did Reaveley no good since after his trial he was executed.)*

*The Inquisition accusation in relation to River Cacheu directed against Miles Phillips contained a curious admission, that the English had obtained slaves from the Portuguese there partly by purchase — which was certainly true for other places but probably not for River Cacheu.*

... landing at certain towns and lands of the Spaniards [sic], especially in Guinea, where normally the Portuguese live in their ships, they were not content with merely robbing and torturing them, and in order to gain a large number of negroes, giving for them in recompense certain petty goods of little value, to cover up the robbery and violence, but also Miles and the others, entering the ships, seized the images and crosses and threw them into the sea or burned them, saying they were papist idols ('Proceso', 651)

#### **(f) The Portuguese official complaints**

*In 1569 a Portuguese envoy presented to the English government two compilations or 'books of complaint', in Latin, in respect of past English 'piracies', one book dealing solely with alleged depredations in Guinea in the course of the voyages of 1562–1568 associated with John Hawkins ('Joanus de Canes').<sup>84</sup> This record, which concludes with a translator's*

<sup>83</sup> Jiménez Rueda, *Corsarios*, 414-5. In Christian imagery, the items mentioned are emblems of John the Baptist.

<sup>84</sup> The record being in Latin, the forenames of Portuguese appear in a Latinized form, while surnames are in sixteenth-century spelling. Below, the latter has been retained, but the former is normally given in the modern

*certificate dated November 1568, contains two sets of material. Presented as an annexe to the first part is a separate document (ff.42–48) reporting a legal process at Cacheu on 10 January 1568, when seven individuals made statements about the English irruption into River Cacheu one month earlier. The on-the-spot officials who took these statements, the proctor and clerk of the contractors, signed the original document, according to the Latin version on 13 July, but this must be a translator's slip for 13 January. The Cacheu material begins with a statement by the officials which is later described as an 'article', and this appears to have the same function as the Articles described below.*

*However, the preliminary and major part of the book (ff.1–41v) represents a legal process at Lisbon in July 1568. Before the Judge of India and Guinea Causes, the contractors lay a supplication, or petition, in which they 'intend to prove' (intendunt probare) the damage done to Portuguese interests, and incidentally to their own interests, by the alleged English depredations on all the Guinea voyages. They aim to offer proof — probationem de rapinis, praedis, latrocinijis, vi, contumelijs, verberibus, cruciatibus, et allijs detrimentas ('proof of robberies, plunder, piracy, violence, insults, blows, tortures and other injuries'). The underlying claim was that, in respect of Guinea, 'navigation is allowed only to Portuguese, not to foreigners' (Article 7). No doubt the whole book was assembled with a diplomatic claim for compensation in mind. The judge is first addressed on 8 July but the statements of seven individuals about all the Hawkins depredations are dated as having been taken by a public notary on 8 and 10 July. An indication of the measure of difficulty in conflating the varied detail in the book is that the notary provided a list of eleven men providing testium (testimony), all said to be residents of Lisbon (f.9v). But two names are those of individuals without any recorded testimony; further, João Dias gave recorded testimony at Lisbon but the name on the list is André Dias; further again, of the seven Cacheu testifiers, one certainly appears on the Lisbon list, and a second if Álvaro Pires of Cacheu has been misnamed as Álvaro Lopes, but the others are not listed.<sup>85</sup>*

*The Lisbon material is in two parts, a set of 32 Articles drawn up on behalf of the contractors, followed by the statements of seven individuals purportedly in response to individual Articles. A feature of these Portuguese complaints is that the majority of the Articles refer to English activity, on the various voyages, at Sierra Leone. But Articles 18–21 refer to 1566–1567 captures of ships off the Cape Verde Islands, and Articles 22–28 refer to the 1567–1568 episodes in River Cacheu currently under study. One of the seven individuals (João Dias) testifies only to episodes on the first, 1562–1563, voyage, but each of the remaining six testify to 1567–1568 episodes. Although the Articles purport to be articles of inquiry put to the witnesses, they are in fact detailed statements, which the individuals testifying confirm but at times enlarge on. How then were the Articles produced? The relevant Articles do not seem to draw totally on the earlier Cacheu evidence, and there is no corresponding immediate evidence in the book relating to the earlier voyages. In actuality, the Articles and the seeming responses largely match each other, the responses simply backing up the Articles. Indeed, the Articles might be said to be summaries of the responses. The explanation is probably that the same individuals gave evidence in a form which is unrecorded, that this was tidied up into Articles, and that the individuals were then required*

---

Portuguese form, even when producing hybrid names.

<sup>85</sup> However, this may be either because they were not involved in the earlier episodes, or because only one of them is noted as being a resident of Lisbon and hence easily available to testify there.

*to give more formal and slightly more extended evidence in relation to specific Articles. None of the evidence is verbatim and we may suppose that the statements of individuals were again tidied and probably to some extent adjusted, to suit the general thrust of the complaints. This means that both the Articles and the seeming responses have evidential credit as primary sources — although subject to a measure of critical scepticism — and both will be cited below. The Cacheu material seems to have been drawn up in the same way, with individual evidence and the officials' statement in parallel. Since it is almost certain that the Cacheu evidence was given several months before the Lisbon evidence, and in consequence may therefore be more reliable, it will be cited first.*

*Where statements merely repeat what has gone before, the evidence is omitted or summarised below. The episodes of the attack on ships and the attack on the town are treated separately.*

### **(f1) the attack on ships**

[Title of the whole section] Summary of the inquiry and the testimony of those who, in this River São Domingos at the port called Cacheu, by Francisco de Pardo, proctor of the Contract, and Gaspar d'Araujo, clerk of the Contract, on 10 January 1568, on solemn oath were interrogated concerning the ships and goods which by force were seized and captured by John Hawkins, native of Britain, and by other British pirates commanded by John Hawkins.<sup>86</sup>

... Fernando Pires, resident of the island of Terceira [Azores], in former times (*superioribus temporibus*)<sup>87</sup> was owner and master of a little ship<sup>88</sup> called *Nossa Senhora d'Aguia*<sup>89</sup> which was plundered and seized<sup>90</sup> by British pirates. ... He was present in the port of Cacheu on River São Domingos when, on 29 November 1567,<sup>91</sup> three British ships with as many boats approached.<sup>92</sup> When he first saw them he realised the danger and immediately raised anchor

<sup>86</sup> This title is inadequate, inasmuch as Article 28 deals with an issue other than the seizure of ships, the attack on Cacheu. It is a curious feature of the Portuguese evidence that Hawkins is always given his full name, 'John Hawkins', albeit in a corrupt Lusitanized form, and never referred to as just 'Hawkins'.

<sup>87</sup> It is unclear whether this simply refers to the dates given above in the document, that is, November 1567, or instead refers to an earlier time. If the latter, it presumably indicates that, by November 1567, the witness, although aboard the ship, was no longer owner and master.

<sup>88</sup> The Latin text distinguishes between *navigium* 'ship' and *naviculum* 'small ship'. The first is an ocean-going vessel, but so are some of the *navicula*, which are stated to sail between the Cape Verde Islands and Cacheu. However, other *naviculae* are clearly so small as to be launches or mere boats. Hence, the Portuguese *naviculae* at Cacheu are here termed 'small ships', whereas the English *navicula* are termed 'boats'.

<sup>89</sup> Not elsewhere named.

<sup>90</sup> The Portuguese statements invariably note that all the mentioned vessels were attacked (*expugnatum/a*), entered/boarded (*invasum/a*), seized (*captum/a*) and plundered (*direptum/a* or *expoliatum/a*). But not all statements in relation to all ships went on to say that the vessel was taken away (*raptum/a*, *ereptum/a*, or *ablatum/a*), although one or more individuals did state this in evidence relating to almost every vessel. Thus, it is not absolutely clear that all the vessels attacked and plundered were taken away, since the statements to this effect lack general confirmation and may, in some cases, represent only a concluding rhetorical flourish, added by the witness, the clerk, or the translator. It could, however, be argued that 'seized' implied that it was not returned to the Portuguese and therefore presumably taken away (or sunk).

<sup>91</sup> The other Cacheu evidence agrees with this date. The Lisbon evidence either merely states 'in November', or else, by wrongly including later episodes, 'in November and December', or in one instance 'in the end of 1567 and the beginning of 1568' (Lopo Rodrigues).

<sup>92</sup> The Cacheu witnesses generally stated that six or seven vessels entered the river, three 'ships' and either 'as many' or four 'small ships/boats'. But otherwise four ships and three boats (Manuel Pires); one ship and three



and with the other Portuguese small ships fled up-stream with all speed and effort, hoping and willing that the ship could escape from the present peril. It was the case that the other Portuguese ships which lacked instruments of war and defence (*munitionibus*), out of fear raised anchor and went up-river lest they be seized by the British pirates. But two ships of the Contract<sup>93</sup> which were provided with arms and guns did not care to flee, preferring to take note and prepare, arming themselves to resist all the ill fortune the Portuguese vessels might encounter.<sup>94</sup> But not long after, in fact the next day,<sup>95</sup> the ship of this witness, with its *munitionibus*,<sup>96</sup> guns and other goods, and the other ships which had fled, were captured and

---

boats (Manuel Lopes). The Lisbon witnesses tended to refer only to the whole fleet, seven ships as they said, but one witness specified three ships and four boats entering the river (Gaspar Fernandes). It was agreed that large ships were left at Cape Roxo, numbering four, five or six. If Hortop can be trusted, the English first entered the river with only two ships and two pinnaces; the Cotton MS account refers to a 'barcke' and some pinnaces, the number missing through damage. However, Hortop claims that the next day two more ships entered the river; unfortunately the manuscript account cannot confirm this because of damage. Although the Portuguese imply that all the English vessels came at the same time, their total of six or seven may not be far out. All the Portuguese sources state or infer that Hawkins in person entered the river, which the English sources deny, most probably correctly, but the Portuguese error is understandable.

<sup>93</sup> Most of the Cacheu witnesses and the officials' article agree that two large ships were captured in the port, these ships often named, sometimes with their captain named, and sometimes described as ships of the Contract. But the officials' statement added the capture of a third ship (*navigium*), coming from Santiago island, with goods, although not stated to be actually in the port (Blás Daveiga Albernaz). At Lisbon the witnesses and Article 24, between them, mysteriously made this a third ship of the Contract, its captain from Terceira, named Francisco Portuguese, setting out for Santiago [mistranslated *in insulam Sancto Jacobi*] with slaves, wax and ivory', and captured when ready to leave, therefore with a full cargo valued at the high price of 10,000 ducats. Hortop referred to the capture of 'seven carvels', but simply meant seven Portuguese vessels; although the *naviculae* were not 'caravels' of either the traditional or the current Portuguese kind, elsewhere the English sources used the term 'carvel' in this loose sense. The Cotton MS account speaks of attacking 'carvayls/carvers', but the number of ships, if stated, is missing by damage; later, however, the account refers to bringing out '2 or 3 of the carvayls', which suggests a further loose use of the term. It seems that the English seized either two or three ships of the Contract. Yet, although these large ships could have been expected to have had aboard a large total of slaves, it is reasonably certain that the English acquired few slaves at Cacheu. What exactly happened to these ships and their slave cargoes remains unclear.

<sup>94</sup> Hortop claimed that the attack on the ships lasted a long time. But the manuscript account states that the Barrett attempted to persuade the Portuguese to trade but was fired on by the caravels, after which, although outnumbered and out-gunned, the English boarded the Portuguese vessels, whose crews instantly fled. The Portuguese evidence confirms the attack and makes no counter-claim of long resistance. Why the witness goes out of his way to draw attention to the fighting capacity of the large vessels, given that they seem to have put up little fight, is unclear.

<sup>95</sup> Two Cacheu witnesses refer to 'the following day', but the rest of the Cacheu evidence and all the Lisbon evidence does not mention a second day and two separate English captures, that is, on one day the capture of the ships of the Contract, on the next day the capture of the small ships. Hortop mentions two separate arrivals of English vessels on one day and the next, but not two separate captures of ships. Despite the Cacheu evidence, it is plausible that at least some of the small ships were captured on the same day as the ships of the Contract. The statement that the small ships fled up-stream does not explain how they came to be captured — it was possible to travel many miles up River Cacheu or otherwise seek safety in one of the major creeks, and in either case it is unlikely that the English could have pursued them so far up strange waterways. Perhaps the crews of the small ships, like those of the large ones, were panic-stricken and abandoned their vessels with speed, something they did not care to expound to the authorities.

<sup>96</sup> I am puzzled by this word and not sure what Portuguese term it represents. The obvious translation, 'munitions', does not seem in a number of places to make sense, and perhaps *munitiones* was being used with the variant rare medieval meaning of 'supplies in general', including provisions.

seized by the British. However, before they seized his ship, bringing it ashore with great speed and care he disembarked the slaves (*Aethiopes*) and the other Portuguese, but could not unload the goods.<sup>97</sup> The same day, the little ship of António Cardoso, a Portuguese, with much ivory and other goods,<sup>98</sup> was seized by the British pirates; as was another little ship belonging to Fernando Gonçalves; and still another said to belong to Álvaro Gonçalves.<sup>99</sup> The loot from all might amount to the value of 8–10,000 ducats.<sup>100</sup> ...

*The above, the liveliest of the Cacheu statements, has gaps in its evidence. It fails to specify that the English pursued the little ships up-river, or that the ships of the Contract were attacked and captured. Other witnesses add informative details.*

... the other great ships of John Hawkins being left at Cape Roxo, as too large to enter the river ... the witness heard from a certain African (? slave) of his who was travelling in the company of Hawkins<sup>101</sup> that five great ships were left at Cape Roxo ... in the port of Cacheu were two ships, one called *S. Nicolau*, commanded by Manuel de Vergas,<sup>102</sup> a Portuguese, and another, said to belong to Garçia Fernandes, now deceased, which two ships with other smaller ships were plundered of all their goods by the British.<sup>103</sup> The witness was himself in a

<sup>97</sup> Hortop stated that the Portuguese vessels were driven 'to the shore, from whence with the Negroes they fled'.

<sup>98</sup> In the Cacheu evidence the goods aboard the small ships were seldom specified. This witness has mentioned slaves, guns and *munitiones*, and another witness mentioned weapons and *alys navalibus instare* (? other ship installations). In the Lisbon evidence, when the goods are specified they are slaves, ivory and wax, and occasionally *munitiones*. Wax was an important export from the lands north of River Cacheu, being in demand in Europe for the production of expensive candles, particularly those for church use. It is surprising that cotton is not mentioned too, this being another important sixteenth-century export of River Cacheu.

<sup>99</sup> Only one other Cacheu witness specified the seized small ships, and he mentioned the ships of António Cardoso and Álvaro Gonçalves, but also an unnamed one (perhaps a slip of the translation) in which he had been himself (Albernaz). The other Cacheu witnesses referred only to 'the other ships' (that is, other than those of the Contract) which were mentioned 'in the article', that is, in the officials' statement; and this specified all three. The Lisbon evidence also specified all three and added details, mainly of the cargoes and values. But one witness at another point (Jorge Valasques, Article 32, see below) recalled the seizure of an additional ship, supposedly a *navigium*, yet of such low value that it must have been actually a *naviculum*; no other evidence confirmed this seizure. The present evidence reads as if four small ships were seized, the fourth being the witness's ship. It is very curious that this ship is not mentioned elsewhere — unless it was the same as the *navigium* noted above. If indeed four small ships were seized, and also three large ones (note 63 above), the total confirms Hortop's statement that seven ships were taken.

<sup>100</sup> Referring to apparently three small ships, another witness (Brás Daveiga Albernaz) put their total value, presumably of ships and cargoes, at 7–8,000 ducats; which was the figure given for all three small ships in the officials' statement. The Lisbon evidence specified separate values for each ship, either 2,000 or 3,000 ducats, but these generally added up to 7,000 ducats.

<sup>101</sup> It is not clear what precisely this means and the translation may be inexact — how did the African/slave come to be with Hawkins and how did he then inform his Portuguese master?

<sup>102</sup> Although not giving separately reported evidence, this man was named in Articles 1, 5, and 17, as one of a group of individuals giving general evidence in relation to English activities at Sierra Leone on the earlier voyages.

<sup>103</sup> The goods aboard the large ships were only specified in the Lisbon evidence. As with the small ships, they were generally slaves, ivory and wax, together with (as stated in the evidence cited below), guns and other weapons of war and instruments of defence. One witness added 'gold', which was not a common product of River Cacheu (Gaspar Fernandes, Article 24). The river was, however, in this period a leading outlet for the export of slaves to the Cape Verde Islands and America.

little ship and was robbed of his goods and possessions ... (Blàs Daveiga Albernaz, knight, resident of Santiago)<sup>104</sup>

... this witness commanded the ship called *Nossa Senhora da Apresentação*, and he with the other Portuguese rapidly fled ashore ... (Manuel Pires)<sup>105</sup>

... into the port of Cacheu in the night-time three British ships and as many boats ... the following day, in the early morning, they attacked two ships of the Contract. Unable to defend themselves, the Portuguese fled and the ships were captured ... (Álvaro Pires, ship's master)

... The Portuguese in these ships, not being able to defend themselves and their fortune from injury or enemy violence, rapidly sought flight on shore, leaving their ships and goods, which they could not save because of the imminent and unexpected peril ... other ships ... captured ... goods plundered, whose value he does not know ... (Martin Lopes of Lisbon)

*The above Cacheu witnesses agree that the Portuguese on the ships escaped by flight, apparently without putting up much resistance.*

[statement of the Cacheu officials, their 'article'] ... a process of inquiry, on solemn oath, by interrogating witnesses as to how an English fleet of John Hawkins, proceeding to Sierra Leone, came into River São Domingos on 29 November 1567, with three ships and as many boats, leaving six great ships unable to enter the river at the place called Cape Roxo; and how the three ships and boats having entered the river and the port of Cacheu, a ship called the *S. Nicolau*, captain Manuel de Vergas, a Portuguese, was by Hawkins plundered and seized, with all the goods in the ship; further, he seized another ship called the *Nossa Senhora da Apresentação*, which belonged to Garçia Fernandes, now dead; further he seized another ship which had come from Santiago Island with many goods; further, he seized a little ship from António Cardoso, a Portuguese, and another commanded by Álvaro Gonçalves, a Portuguese, and a ship (*navigium*) of Ferdinando Gonçalves, a Portuguese, which had come from Santiago Island. The plunder all told could amount to seven or eight thousand ducats. ... Hence it is necessary that all this should be made known and reported to the contractors in Lisbon ...<sup>106</sup>

*The Lisbon evidence follows. Articles 22–28 deal with the alleged English depredations in River Cacheu. The dates given in Article 22 represent the English encounter with the Portuguese 'on the coast', that is, from River Cacheu ('River São Domingos') to Sierra Leone, and not merely the encounter in River Cacheu, but even so are wrong, inasmuch as they extend the Sierra Leone visit to March when in fact the fleet left in early February. These dates also appeared in the evidence of Salvator Fernandes. One witness, Jorge Valasques, suddenly recalls, at the very end of his testimony and after reporting events at Sierra Leone, the seizure of another ship at River Cacheu, a seizure not elsewhere reported.*

Article 22. In 1567 in November and December and in 1568 in January, February, and March, John Hawkins with seven English ships and four boats and carrying all kinds of instruments of war came to the coast and to River Saõ Domingos. And there attacked and robbed many Portuguese ships, even ships of the Contract. These English pirates were not content with

<sup>104</sup> According to Article 3, in 1562–1563 this man had a ship of which he was captain (*navarchus*) seized by the English in River Scarcies and he was set ashore in River Mitombi (i.e. River Sierra Leone).

<sup>105</sup> This man was named in Articles 1, 5 and 17 as a general witness in respect of English activities at Sierra Leone on the earlier voyages.

<sup>106</sup> The above is a loose translation of a very long and at points somewhat obscure, legalistic statement.

assaults and robberies but, going ashore, they fired the fields (*agris*)<sup>107</sup> and seized and carried away with them ivory, wax and a great number of slaves and many other things.<sup>108</sup> Then John Hawkins and the other pirates with his/their ships went to Sierra Leone ... Moreover, many cruelties and insults and wickednesses were committed by the English. And in River São Domingos one ship called the *S. Nicolau*<sup>109</sup> was seized by the English, with three brass falcons and other guns and instruments of war.<sup>110</sup> All of which might be worth 6,000 ducats.<sup>111</sup> And the captain of the captured ship was Manuel de Verga.

Article 23. At the same time, in River São Domingos John Hawkins with his ships and armed men attacked and captured another ship called *Nossa Senhora da Apresentação*, which with supplies, guns and other things was worth 4,000 ducats.

Article 24. At the same time, a ship of the contract sailing from the port of São Domingos to Santiago Island with slaves, wax, ivory and other goods to the value of over 10,000 ducats, was attacked and held by force by John Hawkins and despoiled of all its goods.<sup>112</sup>

Article 25. At the same time, in the same river, he attacked and seized a ship belonging to António Cardoso, a Portuguese, containing slaves and other goods worth 2,000 ducats.

Article 26. At the same time, in the same river, this John Hawkins seized a ship belonging to Fernando Gonçalves, a Portuguese, with goods worth more than 3,000 ducats.

Article 27. At the same time, in the port of São Domingos,<sup>113</sup> John Hawkins, with armed pirates and attendant ships, seized a ship and its goods worth 2,000 ducats, which

<sup>107</sup> A curious activity, and in the mid dry season none too easy. Even if 'the fields' means the countryside in general and particularly any thatched houses encountered, it seems more rhetorical than exact.

<sup>108</sup> Whether in fact Hawkins acquired many slaves by the English activities in River Cacheu is very doubtful. A month later the total of slaves acquired at various points on the Guinea coast was only 150. The statement (above) of one of the English captives to the Spanish authorities, to the effect that, at Cacheu, Hawkins in person tortured six Portuguese merchants to make them produce fifty slaves each, making a total of 300, seems sheer invention. The Portuguese evidence certainly wishes to give the impression that the English acquired slaves from almost all the captured vessels, understandably. But Fernando Pires admits that his slaves were hurried ashore, and possibly other ships did the same. In fact, it may be doubted whether the English had time to clear all the other goods on the captured ships. For instance, it is likely that they appreciated the value of ivory rather than that of wax, and abandoned the less valuable (and portable) commodity. However, though the Portuguese probably exaggerated their losses, they did lose all the goods still in those ships which were captured and either carried off or sunk.

<sup>109</sup> Although this ship and the one in Article 23 were termed ships of the Contract by two of the Cacheu witnesses, the term is not used for these ships in these articles, but is used for the ship in Article 25 which was not so termed in the Cacheu evidence.

<sup>110</sup> The armament of this ship suggests a vessel fitted for long-distance travel and therefore very likely to be a ship of the Contract committed, at least at times, to carrying slaves to America.

<sup>111</sup> The value of the large ships, or ships of the Contract, was not given in the Cacheu evidence, but was no doubt supplied at Lisbon by the contractors themselves. It is nowhere made clear whether the attributed values referred to the ships as well as to their cargoes, but it may be presumed to have been the case. Most probably they were inflated values.

<sup>112</sup> Despite the wording, it appears from the evidence cited below that this ship was not attacked at sea but in the port of Cacheu. The value of this ship far exceeds that of any of the small ships; further, it exceeds that of either of the other large ships. This may indicate that it was fully loaded, whereas the other large ships were not.

<sup>113</sup> At other points in the document this is termed the 'port of Cacheu'.

belonged to a Portuguese named Álvaro Gonçalves.

[Response to Article 22]... in November and December 1567 and January 1568 ... seven English ships and other boats ... entered, on pretext of war, River São Domingos, in which place the office of the Trading Contract (*domus contractionis*) is located, sited and constructed, in which place the collection of royal dues (*Regia vectigalia*) and tribute is carried out by the officers and factors of António Gonçalves and Duarte Leão,<sup>114</sup> and in which place there are two settlements of Portuguese, one at the port of Cacheu and the other at Buguendo. John Hawkins with three ships and four armed boats (the remainder of the English vessels remained just outside the river) came to the river and there fought and captured a ship of the Contract ... with three falcons and other guns, and ivory, wax, slaves and other goods, worth 6,000 ducats ... and carried off by the English ... The Portuguese, spoilt of their goods and a ship, in terror of the hand-guns (*arcabustiorum*), and in danger by land, sought flight into the interior.

[Response to Article 23] ... a ship *Nossa Senhora da Apresentação* seized and carried off ... The Portuguese, when they saw the ship and goods seized, sought to save their lives by immediate flight to a safe place. Moreover, he says that it was not possible to complete its voyage because of the English pirates who have closed and occupied the seas and the rivers of this region, which belongs to the King of Portugal.

[Response to Article 24] ... a ship of the contract with a captain from Terceira whose name he cannot remember ... seized and carried off ... the captain and other Portuguese, with many insults and much cruelty were thrown on land<sup>115</sup> ... the captain and others were subjects (*clientes*) of the King ... setting out for Santiago Island with the goods, this being a regular trade, in Portuguese called a *resgate* ...

[Response to Article 25] ... boat of Álvaro Cardoso ... seized and took away against law and right, especially since the Portuguese and the clients of the King in this river were peaceful, without arms and without offensive weapons (*ferro*).

[Response to Article 26] ... Fernando Gonçalves Barrasa ... the witness was in this ship ... seized and carried off ...

*The above responses were given by Gaspar Fernandes, ship's pilot (moderator), of Lisbon.*<sup>116</sup>

[25] ... the Portuguese in great terror rushed ashore ...

[27] ... little ship ... seized and taken away ... (Mattheus Fernandes, ship's officer of Lisbon)<sup>117</sup>

[22] ... took away ships, including the ship of Manuel Davega ...

[25] ... he heard that when John Hawkins anchored in the river he seized a boat belonging to Álvaro Cardoso ...

[26] ... he heard that ...

<sup>114</sup> For the crown's Guinea contract (that is, a farmed monopoly to trade in certain goods, notably gold and slaves, to certain reserved markets) and for these named contractors, see Maria Emília Madeira Santos, ed., *História Geral de Cabo Verde, volume II* (Lisbon/Praia, 1995).

<sup>115</sup> The ejection on to land of Portuguese crews of attacked ships was regularly alleged in entries relating to attacks during the earlier English voyages, whereas the killing of individual members of crews was seldom alleged.

<sup>116</sup> This man was named in Articles 1, 5, and 17 (and described there as as a pilot, *gubernator*) as a general witness in relation to English activities at Sierra Leone on the earlier voyages.

<sup>117</sup> This man was named in Articles 5 and 17 (and described there as as a sailor) as a general witness in relation to English activities at Sierra Leone on the earlier voyages.

[27] ... he heard that ... (Lopo Rodrigues, merchant of Lisbon)<sup>118</sup>

[24] ... a ship of the Contract commanded by Francisco, surname Portuguese ...

[32] ... Further, he says that in this river, in November,<sup>119</sup> a ship of António de Brito, a Portuguese, was seized by Hawkins, together with goods worth 3,000 ducats.<sup>120</sup> (Jorge Valasques)<sup>121</sup>

[22] ... The captain and the sailors and other Portuguese, despoilt of both goods and ship, in great wretchedness (*paupertate*) were thrown on land ...

[24] ... ship of the Contract ... ready to leave. But it was attacked before it could raise anchor ...

[25] ... saw it with his own eyes ... (Salvador Fernandes)<sup>122</sup>

*Contrary to what is said in the Cotton MS account, the Portuguese evidence implies that the English attacked without any invitation to trade, any discussion or any parley; but agrees that those on the ships put up little or no resistance, indeed it hints at total panic. Nor does the Portuguese evidence support the claim that after the ships were seized the English made any further attempt to negotiate. While the Portuguese evidence does not always specify that ships attacked, seized and plundered were actually taken away (see note 90 above), which may be significant, it seems likely that most, if not all, were lost to the Portuguese, being either removed from the port or sunk. One Portuguese witness (Gaspar Fernandes, Article 29) noted that Hawkins had proceeded to Sierra Leone with his ships and boats 'plus other large and small ships stolen from the Portuguese'. Yet it is almost certain that Hawkins did not take down-coast all the vessels found in the port. Hortop stated that 'we tooke the Carvels and brought them into the river where the rest of our fleete met us', having spoken previously of 'seven carvels'. Since the large ships could not enter the river, any meeting must have been off its mouth, at sea. However, the manuscript account states that Barrett was ordered to bring '2 or 3 of the carvayls owte with him', and that, after a delay, Hawkins 'toke the saide carvayls with him alongest'. It is likely that Hortop was wrong, and that the English attempted to obtain a ransom for the other removed vessels and when this failed (as we must assume that it did, unless both parties kept silent about this), sank them in the river or where the fleet lay. It is also likely that Hawkins took with him only one or more of the smaller vessels, since the larger ships were unable to enter the minor rivers on the coast he intended to visit. Certainly Hawkins' fleet appears not to have increased by seven vessels. However, at least one vessel obtained at 'Rio Grande' reached the Caribbean, where Hawkins disposed of*

<sup>118</sup> This man was named in Articles 1 and 5 as a general witness in relation to English activities at Sierra Leone on the 1562–1563 voyage.

<sup>119</sup> Although this appears in a response to Article 32 which, in the case of the evidence of other witnesses relates to events at Sierra Leone, the present witness ignores Articles 30–31 which also generally deal with Sierra Leone and his response to 32 does not mention Sierra Leone or any river there. 'This river' therefore refers back to his responses about River São Domingos, as is confirmed by the date of November, when Hawkins was at River Cacheu but not yet at Sierra Leone.

<sup>120</sup> Described as a *navigium*, the low value suggests that it was actually a *naviculum*.

<sup>121</sup> This man was named in Articles 5 and 17 as a general witness in relation to English activities at Sierra Leone on the earlier voyages.

<sup>122</sup> This man was named in Article 17 as a general witness in relation to English activities at Sierra Leone on the 1565–1566 voyage.

*it.*<sup>123</sup>

## **(f2) the attack on the town**

... Moreover the British landed in the port of Cacheu to plunder, destroy and burn houses and homes.<sup>124</sup> Some of our men were killed, the remainder and the Africans retreating to the interior. (Fernando Pires)

... from the plundered and burnt town, the townspeople and Portuguese sought refuge in flight, to save their lives from the flames ... (Blàs Daveiga Albernaz)

... the witness and others fled from the burning [of Cacheu] into the woods ... (Rodrigo de Sousa)

... the Portuguese and townspeople (*municipes*) sought refuge in the woods and hills ... (Álvaro Pires)

... some, both British and Portuguese, were killed in the battle ... (Manuel Lopes)

*The Cacheu witnesses agree about the attack on the town, the deaths of Portuguese settlers and African townspeople, and the flight of others, but only Manuel Lopes mentions the subsequent battle and the English casualties. The Cacheu officials' statement is equally thin*

... Moreover, these Britons led by Hawkins, landing in this port of Cacheu, plundered and burnt the whole town (*municipium*), a great calamity. ...

*The Lisbon evidence adds some nice rhetoric but little of substance, other than putting a value on the damage, a very large sum which nevertheless is presented without any details as to how it was arrived at.*

Article 28. Hawkins, having entered River São Domingos, ordered his soldiers and officers to land from the ships. They devastated and burnt a certain town (*pagum*) called Cacheu. Here the plunder amounted to 30,000 ducats; even worse, many Portuguese gentry (*homines nobiles*) and other townspeople (*municipales*)<sup>125</sup> were killed by the English.

[Response to Article 28] On the 2nd or 3rd of December, John Hawkins with his officers and men landed with guns, pikes, swords and other weapons, and attacked the town (*municipium*) of Cacheu. This is the residence of Portuguese, many of them gentry (*homines nobiles*), and other men, subjects of the King of Portugal. This town, with its houses and households, was totally destroyed and burnt by the English ... Moreover, many countrymen (*patritii*) and natives were killed ... witness was present. (Gaspar Fernandes)

<sup>123</sup> In the Caribbean, 'oure generall commaunded to have all thinges that were servisable owte of the small barcke which oure generall had at Rio Grande in Guynea, and bycawse she was weak and not able to serve the towrne any longer to sincke her in the sea, all the which done ... (Cotton MS account, f.38v). If, in a list of vessels leaving Africa (f.29), 'the carvayle that we had at [*Cap Blanc*]' was — as Williamson suggests by his conjectural insertion — indeed the vessel obtained at Cap Blanc, then another vessel on the list, the 'small barck which he bowght of the Portingalls aforesaid' would seem to be the one above, obtained at River Cacheu. The account would thus claim that it was bought, not seized. However, if instead the inserted words should be, not 'Cap Blanc' but 'Rio Grande', then the 'carvayle' would be the one obtained at Cap Blanc, which some English claimed had been 'bowght of the Portingalls'.

<sup>124</sup> For the date of this action, see below.

<sup>125</sup> While the *municipales* might refer solely to the resident Portuguese other than gentry, it more likely refers to either the African townspeople or to both African and Portuguese residents.

... on 3 or 4 December ... the town (*pagum*) of Cacheu ... in the battle many Portuguese gentlemen and countrymen were killed ... with his own eyes he saw the conflagration ... (Mattheus Fernandes, ship's officer of Lisbon).

... Hawkins with his 200 armed men ... (Lopo Rodrigues)

... on 3 or 4 December ... a great number of armed men disembarked and assembled for slaughter and plunder ... killed in this wretched and deplorable battle. (Jorge Valasques)

... at the end of November 1567 and the beginning of 1568 [error for 'December'] ... Hawkins ... having carried out his assault and burning, went down-river to the coast. (Salvador Fernandes).

*The Cotton MS account of the attack on the town is very much fuller (despite the damage in the manuscript at a critical point) than the Portuguese references. It claims that the English were ambushed by an African army but that some 100 Portuguese 'encoraged the negros to sette upon oure menne'. It mentions Africans and Englishmen killed, but no Portuguese. However, it is plausible that a few were killed in the battle, adding to any killed when the ships were attacked and when the town was assaulted. The Portuguese emphasis on 'gentry' being killed is striking, although the presence of any number of any form of gentry on trading vessels and at a trading station is unlikely. Patently the contractors' officials at Cacheu were not killed. The English admit to a repulse and defeat, but the Portuguese evidence prefers to be silent about this victory and to suggest a picture of the local Portuguese as merely helpless victims.*

*In conclusion, while the Portuguese statements on the whole River Cacheu episode tend to the rhetorical, as befitted claims for compensation and a document to be presented by a diplomat to the English government, they contain points likely to be true. That Hawkins personally entered the river was an understandable inference, although almost certainly incorrect. The extent of the damage claimed was no doubt exaggerated. It will be noted that the Portuguese evidence fails not only to record the English set-back but also to give credit for military success to the African defenders of the town.*



## 8. AT THE ILES DE LOS AND IN RIVERS UP TO SIERRA LEONE (15 DECEMBER 1567 – EARLY JANUARY 1568)

### (a) The public account (553)

From thence we past the tyme upon the coast of Guinea searching with all diligence the rivers from rio graunde unto the Searliona [Sierra Leona]<sup>126</sup> till the xii. of Januarie in whiche time we had not gotten together 150. Negrose ...

*On Hawkins' first voyage (1562–1563), although his own very brief account failed to mention it, according to the Portuguese 'book of complaints', the English, when sailing this 300-mile stretch of the Guinea coast, visited and carried off a ship in 'Rio das Pedras' — that is, River Pongas/Pongo, a river SSE of 'Rio Grande' and the Bissagos Islands, and NNW of the Iles de Los (Article 1). It is possible that, on this preliminary reconnaissance of the coast, the English stopped at other localities before the Iles de Los, but there is no record of this. On his second voyage (1564–1565), Hawkins had again sailed this stretch of coast, calling momentarily at one of the Bissagos Islands (probably Ilha Formosa) and later for a few days at 'Sambula', one of the Iles de Los (most likely one of the two larger islands, now known as Tamara and Kassa). In both places the English had landed, and at the latter, as well as watering and seizing from village storehouses large quantities of foodstuffs, had captured Africans.<sup>127</sup> A week after the fleet assembled at this island, the smaller vessels had been sent into a river named as the 'Callowsa', where contact was made with two Portuguese caravels and slaves were obtained in unclear circumstances. Allegedly at Portuguese instigation, the English had then, 'on the way back', attacked an African town, but were driven off, with losses. After the fleet proceeded to Sierra Leone, small boats were sent back to River 'Casseroes', where in five days they 'dispatched their business', presumably obtaining slaves, probably by purchase from Portuguese ships or traders. In 1567–1568 Hawkins was repeating his previous trawl along this coast, which may partly explain the brevity of reference.*

### (b) Miles Phillips' account (563)

... and so afterward passing the time upon the coast of Guinea, untill the twelft of Januarie, wee obtained by that time the number of 150 Negroes.

*Phillips confirms but adds nothing to the printed account.*

### (c) Job Hortop's account ([4]–[5]; 3: 487–8)

From thense to Surroleon [Sierra leona], [where be monstrous fishes called Sharkes, which will devoure men.], and by our Generall I [amongst others] was sent in the Angell with other {two} pinnaces into the river called the Calowses<sup>128</sup> to seeke the {to seeke two} Carvells that traded with the Negros: [wee tooke one of them with the Negros, and brought them away].<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup> The form of the toponym, 'the Searliona', perhaps shows some appreciation of the Portuguese origin of the term, *serra leõa* 'leonine range of hills', in Portuguese texts often referred to as merely *a serra* 'the *serra*'.

<sup>127</sup> They also collected lengthy and detailed information, apparently in part from a Portuguese informant, about a variety of local matters, the information eventually appearing in the account of the voyage published by Hakluyt (1589, 526–7).

<sup>128</sup> The revised text also has 'Calowses' but Hakluyt has 'Calousa', no doubt to adjust the term to the 'Callowsa' of the account of Hawkins' second voyage (Hakluyt 1589, 527).

<sup>129</sup> Hortop's text implies that the small ships were sent into the rivers after the main fleet reached Sierra Leone, but the Cotton MS account states otherwise, the small ships setting out from the Îles de Los. (Yet on the previous

[In this river] the same night {in the night time} we had one of our pinnases bulged by a sea horse, and thereby our men throwne over bord, yet saved by meanes of swimming to the other pinnases, except onely two of our men, who holding fast one by an other, were carried away by the same sea horse, who did eat them.<sup>130</sup> The sea horse {This monster} is in forme like a horse in all proportions, saving that his feete {legs} are very short, and his teeth are verie great, long [a span in length], and crooked, like the tuskes of a wilde boare. The Negroes doe hunte the sea horses and doe kill them verie often, which is done in this manner. The sea horses do commonly come in the night foorth of the sea, and steale up into the woods and cabins of the Negroes, and if the sea horse can meete with anie of them, he will dragge them into the river, and there eat them {goe on land into the woods, seeking at unawares to devoure the Negroes in their cabbins}, wherefore the Negroes keepe watch and when the sea horse is gone up into the woods, they do lay a great tree overthwart the way, and then follow the horse with bowes, arrowes and darts to the tree, where the sea horse can not get over and then they do kill him.<sup>131</sup>

From thense we entered the river of Causserus<sup>132</sup> in Ginney, where we tooke some negroes for other commodities {there were other Caravels trading with the Negroes, and them we tooke}, and then set sail to Saraleon where our Generall was, {From thence with the Angel, the Judith, and the two pinnesses, we sailed to Sierra leona ...}

*As other sources show, and following the procedure of his previous voyage, Hawkins' fleet halted at the Iles de Los. The ships watered at the islands, before the larger vessels moved on to Sierra Leone. But there is no record of any contact with Africans on the islands on this occasion, and sources below state that the island called at was deserted.<sup>133</sup> After the fleet reached the islands, some of the smaller vessels were sent into nearby rivers, 'searching with all diligence', apparently for contacts with Portuguese trading vessels, as had happened on the previous occasion. From these vessels a number of slaves and possibly other commodities were obtained. Hortop, who mistakenly has the fleet going to Sierra Leone first, lists the smaller vessels as the Angel, and two pinnaces, but in his second version adds the Judith.*

---

voyage the small ships seem to have gone back, at least to River Scarcies, from Sierra Leone.) The revised text seems to be saying that the English captured not only the Portuguese vessel but also either the Africans who were trading with it or the slaves already aboard.

<sup>130</sup> The last clause is omitted in the second version, which, however, later claims, still, that the animals 'devoure' humans. The whole following passage on the hippopotamus is rewritten and slightly abbreviated in the second version. Hortop's account of the hippopotamus is curiously similar to that in the Cotton MS account below, which is difficult to explain.

<sup>131</sup> Whereas Hortop's previous interest in musk cats and his later interest in oysters, bananas and elephants reflect largely practical opportunities of obtaining foodstuffs or making economic gain, his interest in the hippopotamus reflects little of either. Apart from the local medicinal use of its hooves and the the local use of its meat, the hippopotamus was of no practical English interest, other than the negative one of its danger to navigation, and like Hortop's later interest in mangroves his interest in this beast seems to indicate mostly a measure of curiosity about the exotic.

<sup>132</sup> The revised text also has 'Causserus' but Hakluyt has 'Casseroes', to adjust the name to the 'Casseroes' of the account of Hawkins' second voyage (Hakluyt 1589, 528).

<sup>133</sup> The Cotton MS account (below) may have stated that the inhabitants of the islands had moved to the mainland, but this would be to rely on Williamson's conjectural reconstruction of missing words. In later centuries the islands were at times found deserted, being visited by the mainland people only to plant, care for, and harvest crops at specific seasons.

*He names the rivers searched as the 'Calowses' and the 'Causserus', that is, the same rivers as were visited on Hawkins' previous voyage. (The Portuguese claimed that not only had two of their vessels been attacked in River 'Caces' on the previous voyage but that a similar attack had occurred on the first Hawkins voyage: Articles 2, 6, 15, 16). The 'Causserus' is River Scarcies, an important waterway NW of the Sierra Leone estuary, whose local name was probably Kase but which became known to the Portuguese as first Rio de Case/Caces and then as Rio dos Carceres;<sup>134</sup> hence, by English corruption, 'Scarcies'. The former river, the 'Calowses', has a less certain identity but apparently lay between River Pongas and River Scarcies.<sup>135</sup> Portuguese accounts do not indicate that Portuguese vessels traded regularly on this stretch of the coast, and perhaps the English accounts are providing novel information. It seems that the slaves obtained were from the Portuguese vessels. How they were obtained is not stated, but most probably by a mixture of trade, threats and perhaps violence. Hortop's second version, but not the first, seems to state that the caravels were seized.*

*The description of English activity in these two rivers on the previous occasion, in 1564, which has general relevance to the 1567 activities in Guinea, is unfortunately vague, and on the issue of Anglo-Portuguese relations tantalisingly so, as follows.*

The two and twentieth [December 1564] the Captaine went into the River, called Callowsa, with the two Barkes, and the Johns pinnesse, and Salomons boate, leaving at anker in the Rivers mouth the two shippes, the River being twentie leagues in, where the Portingals roade: he came the five and twentieth, and dispatched his busines, and so returned with two Caravels, loaden with Negroes. (Hakluyt 1589, 527)

*This muddy sentence fails to clarify where exactly the English vessels went, and in particular leaves it unclear whether the slaves were seized or bought. It certainly reads as if the caravels were seized from the Portuguese, yet in the following paragraph, describing the near-disastrous attack on an African town, individual Portuguese appear to be cooperating with the English — and are eventually blamed for the fiasco. This failed attack on Bymba town in 1564 much resembles the failed attack on Cacheu town in 1568. Yet the earlier failure did not deter the later attempt, although Hawkins, who led in 1564, absented himself in 1568.*

The 27. the Captaine being advertised by the Portingals, of a Towne of the Negroes, called Bymba, being in the way as they returned,<sup>136</sup> where was not only great quantities of golde,<sup>137</sup>

<sup>134</sup> Or Rios dos Carceres, since there are actually two rivers with a single estuary, now known as Great Scarcies and Little Scarcies.

<sup>135</sup> Portuguese sources occasionally mention an ethnic group, the 'Calus', seemingly living near the Iles de Los, and also a 'rio dos Calus', but the references are vague as to the exact locality of each (Donelha, *Descrição*, 245, note 127). The Iles de Los lie at the tip of the Kalum Peninsula (off the site of modern Conakry) and probably the terms 'Calus' and 'Kalum' bear some relationship to each other. The potanym 'Calowses' is recorded only in the English accounts. If on an outward voyage the 'Calowses' preceded the Kalum Peninsula it was one of the two waterways at the head of Sangaréa Bay, River Dembia or River Dubréka; if it lay past the peninsula, to the SE, it was presumably one of the two main rivers between the Iles de Los and River Scarcies, River Mellakuri or River Forécária. Since the fleet was generally heading SE towards Sierra Leone, it could be argued that it is more likely that the smaller vessels visited a river in the forward direction, to the SE. Yet, on the other hand, it seems that on the previous Hawkins voyage, having reached Sierra Leone, the smaller vessels were sent to River Scarcies, that is, backward.

<sup>136</sup> Bymba, lying between River Callowsa and the Iles de Los, is unidentified. The town apparently lay on the coast and had islands nearby, points fitting several localities. While the description, 'other Islandes', would seem

but also that there were not above fortie men, and a hundred women, and children in the Towne, so that if hee woulde give the adventure uppon the same, hee might gette a hundreth slaves:<sup>138</sup> with which tydings hee beeing gladde, because the Portingals shoulde not thinke him to bee of so base a courage, but that hee durst to give them that, and greater attempts:<sup>139</sup> being thereunto also the more provoked with the prosperous successe he had in other Islandes adjacent, where he had put them all to flight, and taken in one boate 20. together, determined to stay before the Towne three or foure howres, to see what he could doe; and thereby prepared his men in armour, and weapon together, to the number of fortie men well appointed, having to their guides certaine Portingals, in a boate, who brought some of them to their death ... [*Once in the town, the English dispersed to ransack for gold, and were them overwhelmed by the Africans, who pursued them to the boats, even the group led by Hawkins having to fight its way back. Hawkins pretended not to lament*] the death of his men, nor yet the great hurt of the rest ... that the Portingals, being with him, should not presume to resist against him, nor take occasion to put him to further displeasure or hinderance ... having gotten by our going ten Negroes, and lost seven of our best men, whereof Master Field, Captaine of the Salomon, was one, and we had 17. of our men hurt.<sup>140</sup> (Hakluyt 1589, 527–8)

*Returning to the 1567 episodes, Hortop's account of the incident with the hippopotamus is confirmed below. His information about the animal, like all his natural history information, seems to have been based, not entirely on observation, but also on what he was told, most probably by a shipmate or by a Portuguese aboard the ship. This information possibly included the error that the hippopotamus ate men (perhaps by confusion with the crocodile), but is otherwise reasonably accurate.*

**(d) The Cotton MS account (ff.25v–26v)**

[?...///] for negros bu[?...]es they had so scoured these [*coasts*] and taking manye of them [?...]es were many that dwelt here [*had removed themselves over*] into the mayne lande which is in sight [*of these islands. The*] nexte day that we ankered here there [*came a certain negro to*] oure ships and yelded him selfe to oure generall. [*Our general com*]aunded one that we had with inborde, that cowlde [*speak the tongue*] of the same place,<sup>141</sup> to know the cawse that

---

to rule out the Iles de Los; yet there had been success there in capturing at least a small number of Africans (Sparke is very unspecific on this point but refers to taking 'certaine Negroes'), and since villages had been raided it might be claimed that the inhabitants had been 'put all to flight'. Perhaps, then, the identity of these islands with the Iles de Los cannot be ruled out.

<sup>137</sup> Thus the English interest in the gold trade of Guinea, strong in the 1550s, is momentarily resurrected, as it was to be in the planning of the 1567 voyage.

<sup>138</sup> That is, the English contemplated with complacency a substantial slave cargo addition mainly of women and children, which suggests their limited understanding of the economics of slaving.

<sup>139</sup> That Hawkins was pushed into aggression against Africans by the need to demonstrate to some local Portuguese the superior power and courage of the English seems a quaint notion.

<sup>140</sup> It is possible that one or more of the Portuguese individuals who witnessed the English failure at Bymba in 1564 were present in River Cacheu in 1568, and that they gave advice to their compatriots and allies on a strategy to defeat the English.

<sup>141</sup> The likelihood is that the interpreter was a Portuguese with long-term knowledge of the coast and its societies. That any of the Africans so far captured both came from this district and could interpret into Portuguese (undoubtedly the intermediate language for the English) seems very doubtful. The local language was probably either Baga or Bullom, but if (as discussed below) the ruling dynasty was 'Mane', the ruling group, including the king and the run-away chief, may have had to be addressed in a language of the Mande family,

he [*had so of his*] voluntarie will yelded him selfe to captivitye ow[*te of knowledge of*] his cowntreye. He awnswered that he was [*a lesser c*]hief belonging to the King of Zambulo, whoe [*ruled over*] a greate parte of the mayne and these ilonds [*where we*] ridde alsoe, and as the kings in Guynea [*had many*] wyves he had comytted advoutrye with one [*of them*] and was not knowen in many dayes after. But now [*he hear*]de by other of his friendes that Kinge Zambulo [*knew*] thereof, whereuppon they cownsayled him to shifte for [*his*] life; if the king showlde take him he wolde put [*him*] cruelly to deathe.<sup>142</sup> Therefore he was come to yealde [*him*] self to vs, bycawse thowghe he showld live in captivity [*he*] knewe that we wolde not take his life from him. Oure generall enquired of him and if he cowlde bring him where Sambulo was. He awnswered that he cowlde and poincted that his towne that he dwelled in was on the other side of a poincte of the mayne land, which we saw plainly where we road vnder one of the ilonds.<sup>143</sup> Oure generall left of taulk with the negro for this tyme and discharged awaye his smaler ships, some to the river of Calowsas and some to the river of Casteos to se what good they cowlde doe in those rivers by trafique, meaning alsoe to departe him self within 2 dayes towards the river of Tengarrame,<sup>144</sup> where the other small ships of oure companie showlde meete him after they were discharged.

The third morning after oure cominge thether, iij howers before daye, oure generall departed from oure ship in pinaces with 120 menne to seeke King Zambulo, having [*?...///*] ever in warre [*?...*] the prisoners they take th[*?...*] whoe doe ly still in the river[*?... In*] this place, so in all other places that we [*were in which are nigh*] of this place in Guynea, they doe eate [*very barbarously each*] other. Among these negros there is a greate [*feast whenever*] the soldiers have taken any of them, eve[*n one man. They*] binde him to a stake and make a fyre hard [*by and rou*]nd about it, and the miserable creature [*while he is yet*] alive they will with their knives cutt of his [*?... p*]laces and roste it, eating his owne fleshe by p[*urpose before h*]is eyes, a terrible kinde of death. The others [*in other places*] doe not thus eate them, but kill them owte of h[*and at the*] first and cutt them of by the loynes and eat the[*ir flesh as*] we wolde befe or mutton, the which oure owne menne [*did witness*] as hereafter I will declare. This eating one [*another, it is*] said, is bycawse they showld be withowt pity and [*fear, as*] well putting in their myndes that they doe not only [*slay their*] eneymyes but gett them

---

perhaps Manding or Vai.

<sup>142</sup> Plausible, in terms of local African customs. But it needs to be remembered that the mother of Hawkins' queen had been put to death by her royal husband for alleged adultery.

<sup>143</sup> The 'point of land' was perhaps Tombo Island (the site of modern Conakry), or if further away, the point at the entrance to either River Dubréka to the North or River Tabunsu to the SE.

<sup>144</sup> In Williamson, 'Lengarrame', a misreading. The account of the first Hawkins voyage claimed that Sierra Leone 'by the people of that place is called Tagarin'; and the account of the second voyage has the ships at anchor at Tagarrin/Taggarin (Hakluyt 1589, 522, 528). The toponym 'Tagrin' appeared in sources at intervals from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century, although its etymology is not known. It represented primarily a village and a locality on the north side of the lower Sierra Leone estuary, that is, on the Bullom Shore (see, for details, Donelha, *Descrição*, 188–9. note 2; Almada, *Tratado Breve*, translation, note to 15/7 on 'Tagarim, Mitombo'). Today the name only appears in Tagrin Point, a locality also on the north side. With moderate reason the term 'river of Tagrin' could represent River Sierra Leone, and it was so used by the 1560s English. However, they were also using the name with an extended and almost certainly incorrect connotation, as the name of a locality on the south side of the estuary. Because of sandbars, the north side of the lower estuary is practically unnavigable, and vessels have always entered the estuary by the deep channel close to the south bank and then anchored at one of the bays on that side. Moreover, these bays contain the accepted and convenient watering places. We can, therefore, be reasonably certain that Hawkins' vessels, when said to be at Tagrin, were in fact lying on the south side of the estuary.

selves sustenance having, as in[*deed they*] have, no manner of cattayle and littell or nothing els to b[*roil*].

Thus within 3 dayes after we ankered here we sett sayle and [*sail*]ed towards Tagarring, otherwyse called Sierra Lion. ... [Activities in the Sierra Leone estuary follow, see below.] Abowt thende of December, oure generall being verry busy as aforesaide, the small ships that oure generall sent to the river of Calowsas came to Tagarrin, having done no good and yet lost ij menne and one of theire pinaces sonk, and all they that were in the river so full thereof that they feare [*?...///*] but they thowght [*?...*] they had not rowed a flight[*shot* *?... when they saw a*] greate many monsters like unto hors[*es* *?...*] up in the water, somtyme above, som[*tyme beneath; one of which*], as they cowlde perceave, strooke one of t[*he pinnaces under the*] water. The bloe was suche that it drave [*in her planks and*] tymbers, so that the pinnace sonck imediatly [*with 28 men*] in her. The menne were in such feare that [*it was a great ch*]awnce that any escaped, but there were other boats [*near, which save*]d 26. The other ii it is thowght the monsters did [*carry away*], for they cowlde swym verry well and yet never [*were seen*]. Oure menne forsooke seking any further and retorned [*towards*] their ships againe with all spede possible, and [*towed the*] su[*nken*] pinace with them a littell way, but the [*monsters*] biganne to followe them, whcreuppon they cutt of [*the foot of*] one of the monsters, having put in his fore foot [*which is*] like unto a horses foote over into the boat that towed her [*and*] allmost pulled her over therewith. These monsters [*by the*] report of the Portugals doe not only sinck boates [*but*] alsoe they have soncken carvayls that have bene 60 tonnes [*of*] burthen. These monsters doe as well live on the shore [*as*] in the water, and eat grasse, and divers tymes are taken and killed by the negros in this sort: theire forefeet are verry shorte and theire hinder feet verry long, so that they cannot goe but leapinge ij feet at once, and bycawse their hinder feet are so long over their fore feet the[*y*] cannot rise above a foote bye with their fore legges when they leape. The negros when they will take them marck when they be feding in the pastures, and in the waye they must come downe they laye a tree or some such thinge acrossse, unto the which when they come and canne not passe over they stande still, when eyther the negros kill them or they dye them selves, being lett from the river without the which they cannot live.

Oure generall, seing there was no good to be done in the Calowsas, sente into the river of Magrabomba, which is to the sowthward of Tagarrin, certain of the smaller ships to se what good might be done [*?...///*] of which was [*?...*] ...

*At this point, the Cotton MS account supplies information about three matters not elsewhere recorded: the proposed visit to King Zambulo (but what eventuated is unfortunately lost by the damage to the manuscript); the description of Sumba cannibalism; and the visit to 'Magrabomba' (again the details lost). If 'Zambulo' was ever encountered, the visit was a brief one, Hawkins setting out for the visit in the early morning of the day on which the whole fleet later left the islands. In 1564 'Sambula' had been taken as the name of an island; in 1568 'Zambulo/Sambulo' is the name or title of the mainland ruler. The term has not been found elsewhere or identified, but see below. Presumably the 'great part of the mayne' included the Kalum Peninsula opposite the Iles de Los, since the king's town was not far away from the islands (it is unlikely to have been the same as Bymba, the town attacked in 1564, since presumably the English would not have been welcome there). The inhabitants of the town were most likely the 'Sapies' noted in 1564 as the original inhabitants of the islands, their recent conquerors, the 'Sumboes', having apparently moved on. The 'Sumboes' were undoubtedly the 'Sumbas' or 'Manes' of the rather later Portuguese sources; the 'Sapies' in this area were either Bullom (an ethnolinguistic unit now occupying a coast to the SE), or*

*Baga (a unit occupying pockets of coast to the NW). However, since the 'Sumbas' were actually a mixed group of followers recruited en route by the invading and commanding Manes, and since the 1564 English reported that the invaders of the islands had large canoes, it is possible that the 'Sumboses' encountered were in fact a Bullom detachment of the Mane movement, the Bullom being a marine people, as the Baga are not and seemingly have never been; in which case the conquered 'Sapies' of this district were Baga, as may have been King Zambulo. An alternative but arguably less likely interpretation of the situation notes a degree of resemblance between Sambula/Zambulo/Sambulo and 'Sumboses/Sumbas', which might suggest that the conquerors had set up a Sumba/Mane dynasty (or perhaps sub-dynasty) on the mainland, so that a Baga population was ruled by a king either Bullom or pure 'Mane'.<sup>145</sup>*

*The detailed account of cannibalism undoubtedly applied to the 'Sumboses' since in 1564 they were described as carrying out this practice. But this account may not be directly connected with the visit to King Zambulo, since it may instead have been inserted at this point merely because the English encountered 'Sumboses' on the Iles de Los on their previous visit. It is not recorded that the English actually saw any evidence of this practices on the islands during either of their visits, but the Cotton MS account later claims that evidence was seen at Sierra Leone. However, some of the information may have been obtained from a Portuguese, since it closely resembles references in Portuguese sources describing the initial Mane attack on Sierra Leone, which probably occurred in the early 1550s, and it undoubtedly represents what the Portuguese continued to believe about the Manes.<sup>146</sup> It is reasonably certain that the Mane invaders of the Sierra Leone district did pursue a terror campaign which included a measure of anthropophagy, a PR device to demoralize their enemies. The eating of human flesh was most likely not, as here suggested, for lack of other food, but as a spiritual conquest of the soul-power of the victims. This was a belief accepted by the enemies confronted, some of whom may also on occasions have themselves practiced anthropophagy. While the English may have witnessed elements of the practice at Sierra Leone, it is likely that this was supplemented by Portuguese information, also derived from a certain amount of close evidence. Yet it does not follow that the details here recorded — fuller details about Mane cannibalism than in any other source — are necessarily all correct, since the account may have been improved in transmission among the Portuguese before it reached the English.*

*Hortop's reference to the hippopotamus incident is confirmed, and although the writer does not suggest that the animal ate the men, he does think that it carried them away (perhaps again a confusion with the crocodile). Contact with a Portuguese informant is noted, and this may have been the man who supplied some of the details about the animal and about an alleged method of killing it (the incapacity to reverse or turn round is probably fictional, as perhaps is a single blow sinking a caravel). Hippopotamus normally only attack boats when they come too close to young calves, and a boat is more likely to be sunk by the animal either upsetting it from below or putting its weight on one side, than by a blow or bite; and Hortop does indicate that the attacking animal put one foot aboard — although it is difficult to believe that the foot could be severed before the animal withdrew it. It is curious that Hortop's description is verbally so close to that in the Cotton MS account.*

<sup>145</sup> In 1564 the 'King of Sierra Leone' complained that the English had assaulted at the Iles de Los 'his people' (Hakluyt 1589, 528). What exactly was the connection between the two localities is uncertain.

<sup>146</sup> Almada, *Tratado Breve*, caps.16–17; Donelha, *Descrição*, 107.

### (e) Evidence of the English captives

Then we went to the Los Ydolos to take water ... (Robert Barrett, master of the flagship)

... to the islands known as Los Idolos where they cast anchor and remained a certain number of days and then they took water without anything happening ... (Richard Temple, gentleman adventurer)

... to a group of three islands which were said to be called Los Ydolos ... (Christopher Bingham, gentleman adventurer)

... to other islands called Aysos where we stayed only one night because the place was unpopulated ... (Noah Sargeant, sailor)

*The name 'Ilhas dos Idolos' (corrupted eventually into Iles de Los) was not given in the 1564–1565 account and may have been learned on the third voyage, from a Portuguese. Other captives than those above gave the name and mentioned the watering. 'Took water without anything happening' — possibly this is stated because on the second voyage, just before departing, the English went foraging, and presumably also watering, with the result that one man, separated from the party, was attacked and killed. Sargeant's vague statement probably applies to the Iles de Los since no other islands appear to have been visited. That the island visited was deserted is confirmed by the Cotton MS account.*

... [slaves] ... together with ... the twelve purchased in Castro, which is a part of this Guinea, from some Portuguese in exchange for cloths and linens ... (Michael Sole, gentleman adventurer)

... smaller vessels sent out to barter for slaves, returned in ten or twelve days with 300, more or less ... (Thomas Fowler, gentleman adventurer)

... another place called Tagarin where there was a river known as El Castre<sup>147</sup> up which John Hawkins sent a tender to ascertain if there were any caravels and negroes, and learned that there were two or three caravels and a number of negroes [? aboard], on which he again sent one of his people who returned bringing with them a negro chief ... (Noah Sargeant, sailor)

*If Sole's statement was correct and only twelve slaves were obtained in 'Castro', that is, River Casseroes/Scarcies, and if the Cotton MS account is correct when it states that 'no good' was done in River Calowsas, this may confirm Hortop's statement that the English were trying to contact Portuguese trading vessels, and that in the latter river they only 'tooke some negroes for other commodities'. But Hortop's second version reads as if several caravels were seized, which seems unlikely if so few slaves were obtained — perhaps Hortop forgot or his ghost-writer misunderstood. Fowler's total, however, appears to include, or refer solely to, the Sierra Leone acquisitions. 'Magrabomba' (or Madrabomba) was a term employed by the Portuguese to describe the coast immediately east of the Sierra Leone peninsula, the Sherbro Island district.<sup>148</sup> The statements by Fowler and Sargeant confuse activities in River Scarcies with those at Sierra Leone, but the former's reference to smaller vessels returning and the*

<sup>147</sup> Sargeant misleadingly considers River Scarcies part of 'Tagarin', that is, Sierra Leone, perhaps because the small vessels went to the former from the latter. For 'Tagarin', see note 18 above.

<sup>148</sup> For Spanish slaving voyages to Magrabomba from the Canary Islands 1559-1564, see Hair, 'French and Spanish voyages', 139. Perhaps Hawkins was told by his Spanish acquaintances in the Canaries about the capacity of this locality to produce slaves. As far as we know, the English had not gone to the Sherbro Island district on the previous Hawkins voyages.



*latter's reference to 'El Castre' undoubtedly refer to activities in the former.*

**(f) The Portuguese official complaints**

*Evidence in the Portuguese 'book of complaints', while detailing the seizures by Hawkins, on his two previous voyages, in River 'Cace', that is, River Scarcies, fails to name this river in relation to English depredations in 1568–1569. However, the earlier evidence refers several times to River 'Cace in Sierra Leone'; while another 'book of complaints' refers once to the 'rivers of the serra'.<sup>149</sup> It is therefore possible that the evidence stated to relate to Sierra Leone in 1568–1569 includes statements which actually applied to English activity in River Scarcies. Alternatively, the lack of specific references to River Scarcies may indicate that on the third voyage the English committed no acts of violence against the Portuguese in that river, only obtaining the handful of slaves claimed in the English sources from the Portuguese vessels encountered there, by purchase. None of the evidence in the 'book of complaints' mentions the River 'Calowsa'.*

---

<sup>149</sup> Public Record Office, London, State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, vol.99, ff.3 (article 6), 11 (Gaspar Fernandes), 16 (Mattheus Fernandes), 29 (Jorge Valasques); vol. 95, f.263.

## 9. IN THE SIERRA LEONE ESTUARY (20 (?) DECEMBER 1568 – 3 FEBRUARY 1569)

### (a) The public account (553)

... searching with all diligence the rivers from rio graunde unto Searliona [Sierra Leona] till the xii. of Januarie, in which time wee had not gotten together 150. Negrose: yet notwithstanding the sickenes of oure men, and the late time of the yeare comaunded us awaye,<sup>150</sup> & thus havinge nothinge wherof [wherewith] to seke the coast of the West Indias, [I] was with the rest of oure companie in consultation to go to the coast of the Mine hopinge there to have obtained some gold for our wares & thereby to have defended [defraied] our charge.<sup>151</sup> But even in that presente instante, there came to us a Negro sente from a Kynge oppressed of [by] other Kynges hys neyghboures desiring our aide, with promisse that as many negrose as by these wars<sup>152</sup> might be obtayned as well of his part as of ours sholde be at our pleasure wherupon we concluded to geve ayde, & sent 120. of our men which the 15. of Januarie assaulted a town of the negrose of our lies [Allies] adversaries, which had in it 8000. inhabitants and verie strongly impaled and fenced after ther manner, but were [it was] so well defended, that oure men prevailed not but loste vi. men, and xl. hurt: so that oure men sent fourthwith to me for more help wherupon considering that the good successe of this interpris might highly funder the comoditie of our vioadge, I went my self & with the help of the king of our side assaulted the towne bothe by land and sea and very hardly with fyre (their houses beinge covered with drie palme leues) obtayned the town, and put the inhabitants to flight where we toke 250. persones men women, and children and by our frende the king of oure side there was taken 600. prisoners whereof we hoped to have had our choyse: but the Negro (in which nation is seldome or never found troth [truth]<sup>153</sup>) ment nothing lesse, for that night he remooved his camp and prisoners, so that we were fayne to content us with those few which we had gotten our selves.

Now had we obtayned betwene 4. and 500. Negrose, wherwith we thought it somewhat reasonable to seke the coast of the West Indias, and there, for our Negrose and other our Merchaundies we hoped to obtaine whereof to countervaille oure charges with some gaines, wherunto we proceeded with al diligence, furnished our watring, toke fuell, and departed the coast of Guinea the iii. of Februarie ...

*It is not stated when exactly the main fleet reached the Sierra Leone estuary, but if, as the*

---

<sup>150</sup> English ships trading in Guinea attempted to avoid the rainy season with its storms and supposedly poisonous rain, but in fact this season did not begin at Sierra Leone until March/April, as Hawkins must have known. Moreover, he contemplated, allegedly, sailing much further along the Guinea coast, to Mina, an enterprise which would certainly have exposed the English to the Guinea rainy season. He was, therefore, perhaps considering the seasonality of the Atlantic passage to the Caribbean, and after trading there, the passage home.

<sup>151</sup> It is unclear whether Hawkins genuinely considered, either at this point of time or earlier, abandoning his attempts at slaving and reverting to the previous English pattern of activity in Guinea, trading for gold, pepper and ivory. For other sixteenth-century instances of an English captain consulting 'the company' — perhaps meaning only the officers rather than the whole crew — about the future direction of a Guinea voyage, see P.E.H. Hair and J.D. Alsop, eds, *English Seamen and Traders in Guinea 1553–1565. The New Evidence of their Wills* (Lewiston, [1992]), 148; P.E.H. Hair, 'The experience of the sixteenth-century English voyages to Guinea', *Mariner's Mirror*, 83 (1997), 8.

<sup>152</sup> Hakluyt's second edition reads 'warres', but in the context this was not intended to be understood as 'wares' but as the 1569 term, 'wars'.

<sup>153</sup> In discussions of the derogation of Africans, this passage is often cited, in the Hakluyt version, 'never found truth'. But in the context, 'troth', in the sense of good faith or loyalty, was perhaps what Hawkins intended.

*Cotton MS account states below, only three days were spent at the Iles de Los, it probably reached there about 20 December. The small ships sent into the intermediate rivers rejoined it 'abowte thende of December', but after their return some were sent south, to 'Magrabomba'. Hawkins and the main fleet therefore at first spent some three weeks at Sierra Leone apparently doing little in respect of acquiring slaves or other commodities, other than by seeking contacts in the estuary with Portuguese trading vessels, as evidenced below.*

*The significant feature of this visit to Sierra Leone, and the second of the most notable features of the history of the third Hawkins voyage while in Guinea, the first being the Cacheu episode, is what followed. The English relations with the Portuguese, always previously ambivalent, continued so, although the ambivalence had become more extreme — and hence more difficult to sustain — by the assault in River Cacheu, the first notable feature. The second relates to the English relations with Africans. Having wholly pursued aggressive and predatory tactics directed at Africans on the previous voyages (as far as we know), and still on this voyage up to this point, Hawkins now changes tack and enters into relations of opportunist co-existence. He offers mercenary services to one side in a local war and thus enters into an Anglo-African alliance.*

*The account of the first visit to Sierra Leone, in 1562, merely states that Hawkins obtained slaves 'partly by the sword, partly by other meanes' (Hakluyt 1589, p.522). Since the Portuguese later complained of attacks on their shipping, it is possible that 'the sword' was as much directed against them as against Africans, or even, perhaps, principally directed against them. Be that as it may, the account of the 1564–1565 visit to Sierra Leone leaves vague the relations with the Portuguese — the wording being typically ambiguous.<sup>154</sup> But it introduces a feature of the later scene, the African civil war. 'Sojourning at Taggarin', after an attack on a watering party (probably at Kru Bay, the most convenient watering place) —*

*the Swallow went by the river about her traffike, where they saw great townes of the Negroes, and Canoas, that had three score men in a peece: there they understoode of the Portingals, of a great battell, betweene them of the Sierra Leona side, and them of Taggarin: they of Sierra Leona, had prepared 300. Canoas to invade the other.<sup>155</sup> The time was appointed not past 6. daies after our departure from thence,<sup>156</sup> which we would have seene, to the intent we might have taken some of them, had it not bene for the death, and sickenes of our men, which came by the contagiousnes of the place,<sup>157</sup> which made us to make haste away. (Hakluyt 1589,*

<sup>154</sup> However, relations cannot have been entirely hostile. The English account states that when the *Swallow* went up-river 'there they understoode of the Portingals' concerning the future inter-African battle; and later, as the ships were preparing to leave, information about the King of Sierra Leone's attempt to capture some of the English was obtained from 'a Portingall, that came downe to us' (Hakluyt 1589, 528).

<sup>155</sup> It is not clear what 'Taggarin' means in this context. The 'battell' seems to involve enemy armies on opposite sides of the Sierra Leone estuary. The English were anchored at one of the bays on the south side, which they appear to have considered to be 'Taggarin'. But if so, where was the opposing 'Sierra Leona'? It is most likely that they were confused, and that the war was indeed between the two sides of the estuary, one party holding the whole south and SW bank and perhaps some of the islands in the inner estuary, and the other the north bank, the modern 'Bullom Shore', and perhaps other of the islands. The war preparations seem to have been in the inner estuary, where they were seen by the *Swallow* — it is not stated that they were noted where the ships were watering.

<sup>156</sup> The Mane practice was 'to warn the enemy of the day and time they would be coming to attack' (Donelha, *Descrição*, 113).

<sup>157</sup> In the nineteenth century Sierra Leone earned the name of 'The Whiteman's Grave', justly.

p.528)

*The history of the confrontations and wars among the indigenous peoples of the Sierra Leone and neighbouring districts being obscure, it is unclear whether the 1568 war was a continuation of the 1565 one, but if so the 1565 'battell' cannot have been decisive. Who exactly were the protagonists on either occasion will require further research to clarify and may well never become clear. The wars were undoubtedly a follow-through from the 'Mane invasions' of a decade or so earlier, which seem to have resulted in new local dispositions, whereby warlords, some of them representing traditional local ruling dynasties but others representing the invading establishment, fought each other, using armies of mixed ethnicities, both local ones and those recruited in the course of the invasion. In fairness to the English, the Portuguese accounts of the situation are also confused and confusing.*

**(b) Miles Phillips' account (563)**

... & so afterward passing the time upon the coast of Guinea, untill the twelfth of Januarie, wee obtained by that time the number of 150 Negroes. And being ready to depart from the sea coast, there was a Negro sent as an Ambassadour to our General, from a King of the Negroes, which was oppressed with other Kings his bordering neighbours, desiring our Generall to graunt him succour and ayde against those his enemies, which our Generall graunted unto, and went himselfe in person a land, with the number of 200 of our men or thereabouts, and the sayde King which had requested our ayde, did joyne his force with ours, so that thereby our Generall assaulted, and set fyre upon a towne of the sayd King his enemies, in which there was at the least the number of 8 or 10 thousand Negroes, and they perceiving that they were not able to make any resistance sought by flight to save themselves, in which their flight there were taken prisoners to the number of 8 or 900, which our Generall ought to have had for his share: howbeit the Negro King which requested our ayde falsifying his worde and promise, secretly in the night convayed himselfe away with as many prisoners as hee had in his custodie: but our Generall notwithstanding finding himselfe to have nowe very neere the number of 500 Negroes thought it best without longer abode to depart with them, and such marchandize as he had from the coast of Africa,<sup>158</sup> towards the west Indies, and therefore commanded with all diligence to take in fresh water and fewel, and so with speede to prepare to depart. Howbeit before we departed from thence, in a storme that we had, we lost one of our ships namely the William and John, of which ship and of her people, we heard no tidings during the time of our voyage.

All things being made on a readinesse, at our Generall his appointment, upon the third day of Februarie, 1568. we departed from the coast of Africa ...

*The inaccurate reference to the William and John (in fact it left the fleet much later, in the Caribbean, and returned to England) adds to the public account which otherwise Phillips' account broadly parallels and confirms.*

**(c) Job Hortop's account ([4]–[6]; 3: 488)**

... then set saile to Saraleon where our Generall was, {From thence with the Angel, the Judith, and the two pinnesses, we sailed to Sierra leona, where our Generall at that time was}, who with companie {the captaines and souldiers} went up into [the] river of Tagarine {called Taggarin}, meaning there to take a towne of negars {the Negroes}, where we {he} found

<sup>158</sup> Note the reference to the English obtaining goods in Guinea, by purchase or perhaps at times by seizure (and if so, from Portuguese vessels), other than slaves.

three kings of the negroes [of that countrey], who had long besieged that towne, yet could not prevaile {with fiftie thousand Negroes besieging the same towne, which they could not take in many yeeres before, when they had warred with it},<sup>159</sup> but by the helpe of our Generall who made a breach, [entred & valiantly tooke the towne] & tooke five Portingals therein yet saved their lives {wherein were found five Portugals which yeelded themselves to his mercy, and hee saved their lives}, and tooke five hundred negroes to our shippes, intending with them to traffike into the West Indies, at that time those three kings being naked people did with their power, drive ino the sea of negroes about seaven thousand men, women and children who all perished {The three kings drove 7000. Negroes into ye sea at low water, at the point of the land, where they were all drowned in the Oze, for that they could not take their canoas to save themselves. Wee returned backe againe in our pinnesses to the ships, and there tooke in fresh water, and made ready sayle towards Rio grande.}

In this river betweene the Iland and the maine,<sup>160</sup> we found trees<sup>161</sup> growing on the shore with the roots upwards, & oysters upon those roots whereof we did eat & found them verie good. In this Iland grow the Palamita {Palmito} trees, so high as any ships maine mast, which have in the tops of them wine, oyle, {they call Palmito wine and Palmito oyle} & nuts, which wine, oyle, and nuts the Indians<sup>162</sup> doe eat and drinke. [The Plantan tree also groweth in that countrey; the tree is as bigge as a mans thigh, and as high as a firre pole, the leaves thereof be long and broad, and on the top grow the fruit which are called Plantanos: they are crooked, and a cubite long, and as bigge as a mans wrist, they growe on clusters: when they be ripe they be very good and daintie to eate: Sugar is not more delicate in taste then they be.]<sup>163</sup> In this place there is manie Oliphantes, whom the negroes do kill by pollicie, for in the day time the negroes do search out the haunt of the Oliphant, which is everie night against a great tree, then they sawe that tree almost in sunder, whereby the Oliphant comming at night, leaneth against it, & falleth on his belly, wherby he can not rise againe being of a huge bignes, whereupon he roareth & then the negros come and kill him. The Oliphant hath a great truncke

---

<sup>159</sup> While Hortop did not serve on the previous Hawkins voyage, it is highly likely that some of the sailors on the final voyage had also served on the previous one. (But the statement in Wright, *Spanish Documents*, 181, note 1, that Barrett had served as master of the *Jesus* on the second voyage does not appear to be evidenced.) If these individuals told Hortop about the 1565 'battell' he may well have concluded that, not only was the same war being fought two years later, but that the siege of the town had lasted at least as long, which he then exaggerated into 'many yeeres before'.

<sup>160</sup> Hortop has not previously mentioned an island at Sierra Leone (or for that matter, if we need to consider whether the passage is inserted in the narrative at the correct point, at any other halt in Guinea, since he failed to note the halt at the Iles de Los). But the Sierra Leone estuary not only contains islands but at points is bordered by shallow creeks and seasonal swamps which make certain mainland areas seem like islands. Since Hawkins states that the African town was assaulted 'by land and sea', it was located close by the river and may have appeared to Hortop to have been on an island. The Cotton MS account calls the town 'Conga', which may be the locality of the island or semi-island named on presentday maps as 'Konkaw', although this is very small. The text later states that there were many elephants (a 'store' of them, according to a side-note) on this island, which is difficult to accept for any one of the genuine islands, which are small — although elephants have been known to swim to and from the islands.

<sup>161</sup> In the second version, the following material on trees — the mangrove and the banana/plantain — is instead inserted after the reference to the Scarcies River ('Casseroes'), where 'this Iland' makes little sense.

<sup>162</sup> That is, the Africans (this term not yet in use). Elsewhere Hortop uses the term 'Negroes'.

<sup>163</sup> This addition in the second version, unless copied from an untraced printed source, is sufficiently accurate to indicate that whoever was responsible for it, whether Hortop or the editor, was acquainted with Guinea.

in his nose wherewith he doth drawe the negroes to him and then kill them, and is of inch [read: such] force that he casteth downe trees.<sup>164</sup>

After we went from Surroleon we past to the river of Reogrand ...<sup>165</sup> Then leaving the Ethiopian land, wee went forward with the Indian voyage. {Here we left the Ethiopian land,/ And tooke the Indian voyage in hand.}<sup>166</sup>

*Whereas the public account and Phillips' account speak of a single king hiring the English, and the Cotton MS account specifies two kings, Hortop has Hawkins allied with three kings — perhaps a Biblical echo? His view that the town had been besieged for 'many yeeeres before' by 50,00 men is implausible.*

#### **(d) The Cotton MS account (ff.27–29) and the evidence of the English captives**

*On the complex activity at Sierra Leone, the lengthy passage in the Cotton MS account is much more detailed and specific than the three previous sources, and the captives' references add certain details. This material is therefore now divided up and presented in separate episodes, each section deploying both sources.*

##### **(d1) The English contacts with Portuguese**

/f.25v/ Oure generall left of taulk with the negro for this tyme and discharged awaye his smaler ships, ... meaning alsoe to departe him self within 2 dayes towards the river of Tengarrame,<sup>167</sup> where the other small ships of oure companye shoulde meete him after they were discharged. ... /f.26/ Thus within 3 dayes after we ankered here we sett sayle and [sail]ed towards Tagarring, otherwyse called Sierra Lion, where we arrived and came to anker the 23th of December, when, after we had ankered, oure generall sent up certain pinaces into the same river to se if there were any Portugals there to have trafique with them, and he in the meane while gave order in oure watering and many other nedefull thinges which muste be done here bycawse this place is the last and most comodious for a manne to provyde him self in before he goe over with the Ind[ies] when he hath his complement of negros.

*The secular Spanish authorities and the Inquisition showed a fair amount of interest in the activity at Sierra Leone, presumably because it became clear that most of the slaves carried to the West Indies had been obtained there; hence, most of the individual depositions of the English captives include references to the Sierra Leone experience, although in some instances only slight or inaccurate ones. That the slaving had involved violence against Africans does not appear to have been any concern of the Spaniards, and apart from mere general curiosity their interest concentrated on the actions of the English in relation to the Portuguese. However, the captives, perhaps misinterpreting the situation, seem to have been eager to have put on record the military activity, probably out of patriotic pride and possibly because they thought the Spaniards would approve a display of European superiority. Very*

<sup>164</sup> The material on elephants was omitted from the second version. Perhaps an editor regarded the reported method of killing elephants a tall story.

<sup>165</sup> Hortop had forgotten the sequence of the voyage and put Sierra Leone before, instead of after, River Cacheu. Such a serious slip makes it difficult to believe that his account was seen, in manuscript and before being printed, even in its second revised version, by any other survivor of the voyage.

<sup>166</sup> The revised version inserts, in italics, this sentence, set out as two lines of verse. Hakluyt substitutes, for both the prose and verse versions, 'Now we directed our course from Guinea towards the West Indies'.

<sup>167</sup> See note 144 above.

*little was in fact said about the Portuguese at Sierra Leone, but such evidence as was brought forward, rather than condemning the English in respect of violence against the Portuguese, tended to acquit them.*

*Hortop had claimed that the attack on the town had led to the capture of five Portuguese, 'yet had saved their lives' — no other source mentioned these Portuguese. Although the wording is not wholly unambiguous, it would seem that the five men were not captives of the town Africans but their supporters, just as the English were supporters of the attackers. How these Portuguese came to involve themselves in an African civil war is not stated, but a passing reference in a later Portuguese source would seem to allude to this episode, as follows.*

The Sapes living at Sierra Leone and within its limits used to be a weak and cowardly people. But after the Manes found their way there, those of today are a war-like people and behave very gallantly, under Mane discipline, the Manes being good captains; and they have many wars among themselves. ... When there is a war between them they fortify themselves and place guns in the forts. They are delighted to have our people with guns and they buy muskets. In these lands they were always the enemies of the French and English, and they fought battles with an English captain called Janaques [*sc.* John Hawkins]. And Bertolomeu Bayão, when he traitorously went there, fought in this Serra with King Sacena, who built fortifications and had many of our men in his town, and they very strongly resisted the English, who left there after losing some of their men.<sup>168</sup>

*The author of the above passage was writing in the early 1590s but had been trading on the coast since the 1560s. If Bayão, a Portuguese renegade who worked for the English, did in fact ever visit Sierra Leone, this being the only evidence, it was between 1564 and 1572 (when he was captured elsewhere in Guinea by the Portuguese and executed), and most likely in 1569–1571 and therefore after Hawkins. It is possible that the passage confuses the two claimed English visits, and that echoes of the genuine Hawkins visit affect the reference to the alleged Bayão visit. Although the English sources do not indicate that any guns were used to defend the town, it is plausible that the five Portuguese were in the town as mercenary musketeers.<sup>169</sup> 'King Sacena', who seemingly hired them, appears in the Cotton MS account below as 'Zacina', one of the two kings defending the town. The patriotic Portuguese author misrepresents the history by claiming that the English (and the French) were never welcomed by Sierra Leone Africans, and by implying, by his silence, that Hawkins' attack on Sacena's town did not succeed. The English sources fully support, however, the Portuguese claim that the English were 'very strongly resisted', at least on the Hawkins occasion.*

*The five musketeers were not the only Portuguese contacted, the English having encountered one or more Portuguese vessels trading in the river before the attack on the town. The public account and the accounts by Phillips and Hortop do not mention this, and the Cotton MS account merely states that Hawkins 'sent up certain pinaces into the same river to see if there were any Portugals there'. Many of the captives claimed that the English had obtained large numbers of slaves, if not all of those conveyed away, from the Portuguese, and they detailed the trade goods used in purchases, goods the ships undoubtedly carried. But such statements were vague and seem to be being applied to all the coast and not specifically to Sierra Leone,*

<sup>168</sup> Almada, *Tratado Breve*, translation, chap.18/11.

<sup>169</sup> For other instances at Sierra Leone of Portuguese assisting with their guns African allies or employers, see Almada, *Tratado Breve*, translation, note to 18/2 on 'Portuguese allies'.

*and they ignored the number of slaves captured. They were therefore misleading and false. However, a few of the leading individuals made more serious claims, that certainly at Sierra Leone 220 slaves were obtained by capture but 50 'by barter'; that against 200–300 obtained in war 'John Hawkins bartered with certain Portuguese for 100 negroes'; and, rather less certainly at Sierra Leone, the English obtained 'from some Portuguese a number of slaves in return for Rouen cloths and other stuffs, and captured a number of negroes in raids' (Robert Barrett, master of the flagship; William Holland, gentleman adventurer; Antony Goddard, trader). Even these statements might well be doubted if it were not for confirmatory evidence from an unexpected quarter. Before the officers of the Mexican Inquisition, in 1570, Miguel Ribeiro, a Portuguese sailor, testified to the daily religious practices of the English aboard their vessels, as observed by him when he happened to be a member of the crew of a Portuguese vessel lying in the Sierra Leone estuary which had been contacted by the English for the purposes of trade. Ribeiro went into details which indicated that the Anglo-Portuguese contact was, on this occasion, a non-violent one, indeed almost a friendly one. This was Ribeiro's testimony, directed against Robert Barrett, master of the flagship, but below re-converted to the first person.*

I first met and spoke to him on the Mytombo River, beyond the Sierra Leone.<sup>170</sup> I was aboard a small vessel which was collecting slaves when this Englishman arrived with two launches brigantine-rigged, carrying about thirty men of whom he was in command, and coming, as he explained, in search of slaves, for which reason he came aboard two or three times. I had the opportunity of eating and drinking with him and subsequently meeting him on the fleet lying off the islands known as Los Idolos.<sup>171</sup> I noticed that he did not cross himself and ask for a blessing on the table, either when he sat down to eat or when he got up; all he did being to cross his hands over his breast and look up to heaven when seating himself ... Every day when I was there, Barrett and those who accompanied him brought out a rush basket filled with books which they put down upon the deck of the ship, and everyone took his copy, Barrett with the rest, and they sat down in two rows and began to sing, each one with the open book in his hand. Happening to take up one of these books, I saw some of the Psalms of David therein, and at the foot of the verses and interlined a musical notation. And so they would sing for half an hour or so, and when they finished they shut up the books, and the English pilot would shout something which I did not understand, and the others would respond just as when we respond 'Amen'.

*The testimony of the Portuguese accords with statements made before the Inquisition by Barrett himself.*

At the mouth of Mytombo River was a Portuguese vessel which was bartering with the natives and which lay close to the land, and proceeding up the river I saw several Portuguese vessels. I spoke to them of my wish to purchase slaves and discussed the price of a slave. I

<sup>170</sup> By 'Mytombo River' is most probably meant the upper Sierra Leone estuary and perhaps also the waterway at its head, now known as Port Loko Creek; and 'beyond the Sierra Leone' means up-river from the peninsula hills, the *Serra Leoa* or 'Leonone Hills' which line the lower estuary on the south side.

<sup>171</sup> That 'subsequently' Ribeiro found the main ships off the Îles de Los would imply that Barrett's launches went ahead into the Sierra Leone estuary while the larger ships were still at the Îles de Los. This seems unlikely, and Ribeiro must have been mistaken, or been misunderstood. If in fact the Portuguese had had occasion to board the English ships at Sierra Leone this most probably indicates that he had been voluntarily engaged in discussing trade with them, a point he would not have wished his Spanish interrogators to appreciate.



sailed up the river in two *batellas* or flat-bottomed boats. We carried certain books called the Psalms of David, which had a musical accompaniment, and we sang from these mornings and evenings.<sup>172</sup>

*But evidence was also given of less peaceful contacts, and also — more relevantly as far as the Inquisition was concerned — of less pious behaviour.*

... heard Ribeiro say that the English had attempted to attack and rob certain Portuguese vessels on the Lord's Day and that they went off cursing and blaspheming. (unnamed witness, in evidence against Robert Barrett)

*Given that the English spent altogether 6–7 weeks in the Sierra Leone estuary (as stated by many of the captives) and seemingly three weeks before the contact with their future African allies, it is entirely plausible that Hawkins not only awaited the return of boats from the rivers to the west and east but meanwhile also made contacts with Portuguese vessels closer at hand and attempted to obtain slaves from them — either by purchase, as the English sources claim, or by threats as the Portuguese were later to claim (see below).*

*During this period when the ships were lying off in the Sierra Leone estuary and some of their boats exploring upstream, sickness spread, as the public account noted (above), no doubt in part because the men were bitten by mosquitoes when ashore or even when aboard.*

Look you, when we were off the Guinea coast picking up black men, we would go ashore of a morning to do that which was needful and more than once we saw some Englishman after walking a distance fall dead without a word, whereupon our captain John Hawkins ordered that before setting out thus of a morning, the doctrine should be preached to us; and for the purpose a preacher would go aloft in the maintop and repeat the Lord's Prayer to us. (Richard Williams, page to the master of the flagship, as reported in evidence against William Collins by an informer, a Mexican cellmate of the two Englishmen)<sup>173</sup>

... lying in the river, a great many of the English fell sick, about one hundred dying ... (Richard Temple, gentleman adventurer)

*Temple must have exaggerated the number dying, but Williams' alleged statement, although reported at second-hand, largely rings true — the English were visiting 'The Whiteman's Grave'.*

## **(d2) The English contact with African kings (12 January 1569)**

Abowt thende of December, oure generall being verrey busy as aforesaide, the small ships that oure generall sent to the river of Calowsas came to Tagarrin ... /f.26v] ... Oure generall ... sente into the river of Magrabomba ... certain of the smaller ships to se what good might be done /f.27/ [?...///] of which was [?...] ready abowte this tyme [?... oure] generall taking greate care how [*he should proceed, there*] came ij ambassadors with one message [*to him. There came one*] of them from there [*read where*] the King of Serra Lion [*had his town, and*] the other from Yhoma, King of the Castros, [*to ask his aid*] against Zacina and Zetecama, ij kinges which [*fought with them in the w*]arres. These ij kinges desired oure ge[nerall, as they ha]d beseged the other [*sc.two kings*] in a towne called Conga, [*which was in the*]<sup>174</sup> river of

<sup>172</sup> On the psalm-singing, see Hair, 'Protestants', 204.

<sup>173</sup> Jiménez Rueda, *Corsarios*, 364.

<sup>174</sup> The words in the gap were perhaps instead 'on an island in the', which would confirm the reference of Hortop

Tagarrin where we ridde, and th[ey had not prevailed], that oure generall wolde bycawse it stondeth in [?... assault] it by the river and batter it, and for his m[erit they would] help him to negros.

*As usual, the Cotton MS account supplies details lacking elsewhere. But it contradicts the public account and Phillip's account by referring to Hawkins assisting two kings, both named, instead of 'a King, oppressed by other Kings his neighbours'. The history of the wars in Sierra Leone in this period is not greatly clarified by the few Portuguese sources, but it seems that, as stated above, after the conquest of the region and its existing polities by an invading army or armies arriving from the direction of Cape Mount to the east, the Mane war-lords, who had made themselves rulers of individual territories, fell out among themselves and wars ensued. Portuguese sources refer to Sacena and to a 'king of Sierra Leone', by name Farma Xere, and by noting 'Juma', ruler of the Bullom, they perhaps refer to 'Ythoma, King of the Castros', i.e. Scarcies. But they lack mention of 'Zetecama'.<sup>175</sup> Although these sources note various wars between these rulers, none of the wars quite matches this one, Sacena and the king of Sierra Leone, who were brothers or step-brothers, being, according to these sources, on the same side. Since an island in the river was the site of battle, it may be noted that the islands were elsewhere said to belong to another Mane king called Tora, much later converted by the Jesuits, who during the invasion had conquered the (unidentified) island of Cabano.<sup>176</sup> A number of the English captives referred to the English fighting for a local chief or king — and 'against two chiefs' (Thomas Bennett, tailor/gunner) — but the only specific references were those following.*

... a negro who said he was the brother of a certain negro chief begged the general to help ... (Richard Temple, gentleman adventurer)

... a negro who was said to be a king or chief of the negroes called Jere ... (Gregory Simmons, musician)

*It is curious that a man of the lower deck, a musician, picked up the name of one of the kings, also that he alone mentioned it in the interrogations. 'Jere', the 'Farma Xere' of the Portuguese sources, is, however, named as 'King Sheri' in the Cotton MS account below.*

### **(d3) Agreement with the kings**

This towne was b[uilt after the] use of that cowntreye verry warlike, and was wal[led round with] mighty trees bownd together with greate wythes [and had] in it soldiers that had come thether 150 leagues. The [kings within] it had in it of principall soldiers negros 6000, bes[ide the]f innumerable sight of other menne, women and ch[ildren. Oure] generall, thowghe it was a harde enterprise, yet by[cawse] he must have departed to the Indias with the negros [above] mencioned, grawnted that he wolde ayde the saide kinges, [and satisfied] with this awnswere the embassadors, whoe afterward gave oure generall gages for sauf goyng and comyng of oure menne and alsoe took gages of us, and the tyme appoincted that oure generall shoulde send his ayde, whoe shoulde doe their parte by the river to anoye and enter the towne, and the ij kinges oure frendes likewise by londe with their campe.

---

to an 'Isle'.

<sup>175</sup> Donelha, *Descrição*, notes 131, 148, 151; Almada, *Tratado Breve*, translation, note to 18/12.

<sup>176</sup> Manuel Álvares, S.J., *Ethiopia Minor and a Geographical Account of the Rivers of the Province of Sierra Leone*, trans. and ed. P.E.H. Hair (Liverpool, 1990), f.86v.

*The description of a fortified town exactly fits that given in Portuguese sources.<sup>177</sup> As regards the number of those in the town, the public account has 8,000 'inhabitants', Phillips at least 8–10,000, while Hortop has 7,000 driven 'into the sea'. These figures were mere guesses and probably much exaggerated ones. That some soldiers had come '150 leagues', a great distance, was probably an echo of the Portuguese belief that the Manes had originated in the far interior. The 'gages' exchanged were most likely hostages, the exchange of hostages being a not uncommon feature of Euro-African trading on the Guinea coast. Possibly an English hostage was the informant about the subsequent treatment of prisoners by the African allies, as later described. The English captives said nothing about hostages or cannibalism.*

**(d4) The failure of the first English assault (15 January 1569)**

Abowte the 27th of Januarye oure generall sent up a small shippe with certain pinaces, and in them 90 menne well appointed, to the ayde of the ij kinges, and sent Robert Barratt, master of the Jhesus, to governe them.<sup>178</sup> When they came before the towne and had talked with the negros of the campe what order there shoulde be in the assaulting of the towne, there was for the espace of ij dayes divers skirmishes where there were above 20 of oure menne hurte besides divers negros oure frendes, for the negros of the towne issued owte divers tymes and shewed them selves verry valiaunt, also oure menne /f.27v/ [?...//] when oure generall saw [?...]arde, he went up him self ...

*The story of the first attack is cut short by the page damage, but a little more can be learned from the depositions of the English captives. It seems unlikely that, in order to please their Spanish interrogators, they falsely reported a failed attack and flight. But the accusation that the African allies refused to join in a co-ordinated attack unless Hawkins was present sounds like invention. Nevertheless, even if only 'skirmishes' occurred, as the Cotton MS account seems to contend, the vigour of the besieged and the English casualties required Barrett to summon reinforcements, or at least the presence of Hawkins himself. The public account admits to the deaths of six Englishmen at this stage, and to 40 wounded, more casualties than later stated by the captives apparently for the whole operation; Phillips and Hortop do not mention this first attack. The public account states that 120 Englishmen were first sent to attack the town, but it is not clear whether this figure includes the 40 joining the African army, and two captives put the number of attackers at 100. Phillips says about 200 English were involved, but perhaps this figure was meant to cover both attacks. Since the English had undertaken to attack from the river and travelled up-river in boats, and since the inhabitants later fled into the river and 'Oze', presumably the English began by effecting a landing near the town; and perhaps after their first rebuff they retired to the boats. No doubt a message was sent to Hawkins by water.*

... the general ordered two of his tenders and three or four of his longboats, with a number of sailors and soldiers ... [another examination] ... by sea sent 100 men in tenders ... (Michael Sole, gentleman adventurer)

... deponent bore a sword and shield ... (Stephen Quince, gunner)

... men who returned say the king was unwilling to give battle unless John Hawkins went in

<sup>177</sup> Donelha, *Descrição*, 103; Almada, *Tratado Breve*, note 17/5.

<sup>178</sup> Barrett, master of the flagship, did not return to England with Hawkins, but was captured in Mexico and in 1572 (?) as a heretic burnt alive in Spain. He will now, by implication, be blamed for the failure of the first attack, having been earlier expressly blamed for the failure of the sortie into River Cacheu.

person ... (John Brown, musician)

... 100 men, retired fleeing ... (Gregory Simmons, musician)

... the English contingent returned fleeing ... (John Holland, ship's boy)

... forced to retire including self ... (Thomas Bennett, tailor/gunner)

**(d5) The successful Anglo-African assault (16 or 17 (?) January 1569)**

/f.27v/ [?...//] when oure generall saw [?...]arde, he went vp him self [*to our men's camp and*] when he came thether he sente the kinges [*our friends a message*] to their campe that to ende this warre [*with good speed he*] was come him selfe in person, and appoincted [*that on the*] nexte daye in the after none at the sound of his trompett [*they should m*]ove with their campe and geve assault to the [*town, for the which*] he sent them abowte 40 soldiers [*from his camp*] whoe shoulde be an ayd unto them, and [*desired that they*] shoulde goe to it with stomack on both sides. [*For this the*] kinges oure frendes gave oure generall great thanks [*for that in his*] owne person he wolde come to their ayd, [*and also*] said that as he had appoincted they wold doe, [*sending*] him divers presentes of gold and captives. The [*next*] daye after oure generall came thether, somewhat [*before*] the tyme of assault appoincted, the beseeged [*negr*]os beganne to treat of peace with the negro kings oure frends by ambassadors, but they were sente awaye withowte doynge any thing. In the after none, as the generall had appoincted, he comaunded to sownde the trompette and, having all thinges readye, beganne to sett menne ashore and put in order, gave assaulte by that parte of the towne which ajoynd to the river. The negros had made many engines, as false diches covered with light stickes, leaves and suche trompery, to overthrowes oure menne in, and with their invenimede arrowes and dartes so defended the walles, having made loopes in everye place to shote owte at for their savetye. Oure generall was everye where incoraging his menne, whoe were so overmatched that allmost all [*were*] wounded and some one manne having 7 or 8 woundes thether, yet his sighte cawsed them to pluck /f.28/ [?...//] comfortable wordes [?...] be at the walles againe, oure gen[eral ?...]gnes letted them not a whit but in [?...] assaulte againe to the walles and ad [?...] spite of all those in the towne the might [?...]efence for entering in the manner of a [?... to]gether with wythes by this tyme the camp [?...]alles on the other side but the negros within [?...] and thowghe vpon the generall, attempte to [?...] but a handfull it semed that the negros made [...] every manne was a thowsand for a greater no [...] cache and within to defende it then were use [...] was yet hole and where the hole camp did g[?] abowte this tyme oure generall, meaning [*once and for all to go*] thorowghe with it seyng that the breache was made [*on the river side*], comaunded to lighte fire pykes and [*charge the pieces*] with fyre worckes, and shott them into the howses w[*hich were*] made of drye flagges, that thorowghe the breache oure menne [*should begin*] to sett them afyre, and thus some with fyre pykes burning in their handes, with force, the negros being put in greate feare with the straungenes of the fyre,<sup>179</sup> gott within the breache and were no soner within but the howses being drye flagges were afyre by [*them*] and by the arrowes that were shott into them with fyre worckes. The negros stode stowtlye in defence and [*sought*] to quenche the fyre a while, but when they sawe the fyre cowlde not be stayed bycawse the howses stood thickly, but wolde consume

<sup>179</sup> Since the local Africans themselves used fire when attacking towns, by attaching burning brands to arrows and shooting them over walls on to the thatched roofs of houses (cf. Donelha, *Descrição*, 107), the English view of the 'straungenes of the fyre' either derived from their ignorance of previous African practice, or else referred to what seems (the wording being conjectural) to have been the English use of guns to impel their fire-brands ('fyre workes').

all, they beganne to scatter and ronne every way. Oure generall for all this kept his menne together dowting the worste, for the camp was not come in, nor had not so sone as they did if the howses we sett afyre had not bene foes.<sup>180</sup> When the negros oure [e]nemyes sawe the towne a fyre when as we had geven assault, the campe having made no breache as yet, they fledde, and so the kinges oure frendes brook downe the walles & entered with their hole camp, fynding no resistance ...

*Although the details are lost because of the page damage, it seems that the English attempt to force a breach in the defences was strongly resisted, resulting in many casualties from arrow wounds, until the fire-brands were used. That the attack was left to the English, the army of the African allies doing little until the day was won, appears to have been the general English view, and since a party of Englishmen was in the African 'camp' may have had some justification. But the kings had rejected peace overtures from the besieged, presumably indicating that they had much confidence in their white mercenaries, whom they had already partly paid. If the attack really began only in the 'after none', the fighting must have been very brisk — dusk falls at Sierra Leone between 6.00 and 7.00 p.m. (throughout the year), allowing only a few hours for this battle. It is not explained when the 40 men sent to the allies' camp, half a dozen of whom were wounded, rejoined Hawkins. All sources agree that Hawkins went to the aid of Barrett, but it is not clear whether he took substantial reinforcements or merely a small party. If the first assault produced 46 casualties, and this out of 120 men, as the public account suggests, Hawkins may have well had to bring up substantial reinforcements. Contrariwise, the public account does not note any reinforcements and seems to imply, understandably, that it was merely the presence and tactics of Hawkins which won the day. The voyage had started with some 410 men, but given the deaths en route and the amount of sickness, especially at Sierra Leone, there must be some doubt whether Hawkins had many additional men to spare. Some of the captives' references seem either not very knowledgable or deliberately false.*

... 40 men returned at the end of four days ... one killed and two or three wounded ... (Noah Sargeant, sailor)

... 100 soldiers ... (Robert Barrett, master of the flagship)

... 200 soldiers ... three killed (Thomas Stevens, gunner; John Hall, cooper)

... two or three killed ... (Michael Sole, gentleman adventurer)

... six or seven English killed ... (Richard Reed, cooper)

... 60 killed ... (Thomas Bennett, tailor/soldier)

... John Hawkins at the head of the greater part of the soldiers and sailors went on shore ... (John Treshan/Truslan, sailor)

#### **(d6) The aftermath of the battle (17 (?) January–3 February)**

/f.28v/ [?...///] negros that were [?...] might gett a great number [?...] the river was full of menne, [women and children], whoe, proving to escape over the water, [were drowned, save those our friends] took and slewe. For all that the fyre b[urned a great part] of this towne, yet we left standing [?...] The kinges Sacina and Setecama escaped, [but there we]re slaine a greate number of menne of name [who had come] in soccer of the towne, as the Kinge of

<sup>180</sup> The last word may be a misreading, for better sense.

Cesta<sup>181</sup> [?... Our] menne here sawe the negros oure frendes eate [*the prisoners whom*] they slewe everye daye in the campe. The negro [*kings coma*]unded oure menne that served with them in the campe [*to have*] rice dressed with palmito oyle dressed everye daye [*for them*. T]hus oure generall having done what [*he could in*] saving negros,<sup>182</sup> when nighte came on drewe above [*the town*] oure companye, as well those that were in the kinges [*camp and*] all other, [*whiles*] the negros oure frendes taryed in the towne and in the campe. We had 4 menne slaine owte of hande of [*those*] that were with oure generall at the making of the breache, [*and*] many hurte, whereof there died 4 or 5 afterwarde. There were slaine of the negros oure frendes Sheri Bangi, the sonne of King Sheri, in the assaulte with divers others, and divers others were hurte, and abowte 5 of oure menne that were with them were hurte, but they escaped all. Abowte midnichte the campe of the kinges oure frendes removed towardes the Castros and sett the place where they had bene in campe afire at their departure. Oure generall mervayl[ing] what it might be, the negro kinges sente him worde that for the death of the kinges sonne of Sierra Lion they departed, but neverthelesse oure generall shoulde sende to the Castros and there they wolde make readye negros for him. Thus they departed as aforesaide, and oure generall came downe to his ships and browghte with him abowte 260 negros that he had taken in the towne. When he was come downe he sente to the Castros, where with the negros the kinges sent and them the generall took and others that he had in the rivers by trafique, we had nowe abowt 470 negros in all /f.29/ [?...//] Guynea is [?... s]icknes there died more [?... The] 7th daye of February oure generall [*departed from Sierra Leone with*] the Jhesus, the Mynion, the William [*and John, the Swallow, the*] Judithe, the Angell, the carvayle that we had at [*Cabo Blanco*], and the ij Fre[nchmen, together with the] small barck which he bowght of the Portingalls aforesaide.

*The total number of English killed in the battle was 14–15 (6 in the first attack, 6–10 in Hawkins' attack, none of those assisting the African army), but the number wounded must have been more than 50 (40 in the first attack, 5 of those assisting the African army, an unstated number in Hawkins' attack). Whereas the public account condemns the Africans for dishonesty, the manuscript account expresses no dissatisfaction with the kings over the distribution of prisoners. Instead, it reports that a reasonable explanation of the withdrawal of the African army was sent to Hawkins and that he was invited to collect more slaves on River Scarcies, points not mentioned in the public account. And since the fleet did not leave Sierra Leone for a further fortnight (3 February according to the public account, 7 February according to Phillips), it is possible that the invitation was taken up, although this is not recorded. The outburst in the public account seems largely unjustified.*

*The public account specifies 250 prisoners ('men, women and children') taken by the English, and 600 by the African army, while Phillips has 800–900 prisoners overall. The public account records a total of slaves when the ships sail of between 400 and 500 (although the 250 now taken added to the previous 'barely 150' only makes barely 400), and Phillips makes the count nearly 500. Given the inevitable inexactitude in most of the figures, there is a fair*

<sup>181</sup> This term, possibly an incomplete word, cannot be identified. It is highly unlikely that it represents 'Cestos', the Portuguese name for a river several hundred miles to the east.

<sup>182</sup> An obscure statement. But perhaps it means that Hawkins rescued some Africans from being eaten by carrying them off as slaves. The intent and relevance of the previous sentence is also unclear. But there may be some relationship to a Portuguese anecdote, which may conceivably have been in circulation by the 1560s and been told to the English, about Portuguese prisoners given rice to eat by their Mane captors and finding among the rice a finger of a missing comrade (Almada, *Tratado Breve*, cap. 17, 82; translation chap. 17/5).

tally. Perhaps the most doubtful figure is Hortop's 7,000 deaths among those fleeing the town, since it might be expected that, even if escape in other directions was impossible, 'men, women and children', given the choice between surrendering and becoming prisoners, and dying in the 'Oze', would not have chosen the latter in such large numbers. It is unlikely, in terms of contemporary local values, that the local king(s) selected only a small proportion of the conquered as prisoners — although they may well have set aside only the men (because of their export sale value) and the young women (because of their domestic and reproductive value) — and then, as Hortop suggests, deliberately driven to their deaths the remainder. Nevertheless, although the public account and Phillips' account ignore this aspect of the aftermath of the battle, the Cotton MS account, unfortunately damaged at this point of the story, undoubtedly refers to a number of the townspeople seeking flight in the river and numbers being either drowned or killed. Since in fact the defeated kings escaped (and Sacena survived as a ruler for many more years), it is possible that not all the allegedly thousands of defenders and townspeople were either killed or made prisoners.

About the slaves after they were taken from Africa the sources tell us almost nothing, other than the numbers sold or deposited at various points in the Caribbean and the uncertain number of the few possibly transported back to England. However, a Spanish informant giving evidence in Mexico commented on a small group of unsellable slaves dumped at one Caribbean point.

... most of them were very thin and emaciated, and sick and swollen, as happens with persons who come from the Guinea coast or from His Majesty's Indies ... (Antonio de Pita)<sup>183</sup>

#### **(e) The Portuguese official complaints**

The Portuguese evidence in the 'book of complaints' relating to Sierra Leone differs from that relating to River Cacheu in one perhaps significant respect. Whereas River Cacheu was first visited by the English in 1567–1568, Sierra Leone had previously been visited in 1562–1563 and 1565–1566. Since the evidence was, within sections, presented chronologically, the 1567–1568 evidence on English activities in Sierra Leone followed substantial references to similar activities there on the earlier Hawkins voyages. Moreover, the evidence relating to the last occasion was often given by individuals who had previously testified in respect of the earlier occasions. This may have affected the quality of the later evidence, inasmuch as the witnesses — or the clerks who wrote up the testimony — did not care to repeat details given earlier. For instance, whereas the earlier evidence regularly referred to River Mitombi at Sierra Leone, the 1567–1568 evidence does not mention this river name. Undoubtedly the 1567–1568 evidence is thin, but this may be partly due to the context of its presentation.

Of the 32 Articles, the first seventeen relate to the 1562–1563 and 1565–1566 Hawkins voyages and refer solely to English contacts with Portuguese vessels, solely at Sierra Leone. Whether the Articles or the individual responses, they generally follow a common pattern. After referring to Hawkins and his ships, they lay it down that Sierra Leone 'belongs to the King of Portugal', hence no foreigners should trade there; further, 'the coast of this Serra is subject to the rule of the King of Portugal and here reside and live Portuguese subjects of the king' (Article 6, response of Jorge Valasques to Article 7). Several of the testifiers or other

<sup>183</sup> AGI, 2-5-1/20, doc.13, 6. While it is certain that many slaves became ill during the Middle Passage and that Hawkins did dump some individuals in poor condition or of little value, this is not the only instance when a Caribbean community failed to admit to the Spanish authorities that any of the slaves it had obtained were other than ailing or useless.

*individuals named are said to have lived 'for a long time' at Sierra Leone.<sup>184</sup> Allegations of ships plundered and seized follow, their cargoes almost invariably slaves, ivory and wax. If the evidence is to be believed, six vessels were attacked in 1562–1563 and ten in 1565–1566. It is highly likely that this past history of Hawkins activities at Sierra Leone, at least as related in the allegations, influenced both the activities in 1567–1568 and the subsequent allegations regarding them.*

*Concluding the evidence given at Lisbon, Articles 22–32 relate to the English at Sierra Leone in 1567–1568, but refer again solely to the contacts with Portuguese vessels, which are alleged to have been attacked and robbed. However, Article 32 undermines the previous evidence by claiming that not only had the English forced the Portuguese to sign certificates of voluntary sale but had paid them for the slaves at an unfairly low price — thus affording proof that the Anglo-Portuguese relations had not been wholly what was previously claimed. Given the evidence of Miguel Ribeiro (above) and the fact that those Portuguese reporting at Lisbon had to cover up any illegal trading with foreigners, while it need not be doubted that the Portuguese vessels at Sierra Leone felt under threat from the more powerful English fleet (particularly if news had arrived of the English bellicosity in River Cacheu) and hence traded under a certain amount of duress, the claim that they were 'plundered' may well have been a slight, if understandable, misrepresentation of the actual state of affairs in 1568. However, one witness (Salvator Fernandes, below) extends the English practice to Lovell's voyage of 1566–1567,<sup>185</sup> and the generality of all the statements makes it just possible that what is being claimed, by Article 32 and those responding to it, is that on all the voyages to Guinea by Hawkins or Lovell such certificates were extracted from the Portuguese. But if so, this may only have referred to activities at Sierra Leone.*

Article 29. This John Hawkins with his ships large and small (*navibus et navigiis*) (plus other ships and small ships [*naves et naviculas*] which he seized from the Portuguese) came sailing to the coast of Guinea and Sierra Leone,<sup>186</sup> and there did many robberies and much villainy. He seized a ship with many slaves and much wax, ivory and other goods,<sup>187</sup> worth more than 5,000 ducats, belonging to António d'Oliveira, a Portuguese, native of Santiago Island.

Article 30. At the same time and place he plundered a ship of Luís Freire, a

<sup>184</sup> Fifteenth-century legislation forbade unlicensed Portuguese, particularly those from the Cape Verde Islands, to live or trade in the Sierra Leone district. Although the legislation appears to have been fairly ineffective by the early decades of the sixteenth century, it is noteworthy that, in the evidence in the official 'book of complaints', probably for the first time, certain individuals, many of them natives of the Cape Verde Islands, openly admit before government and judicial officers, not only to trading at Sierra Leone but even to residing there. However, some of the vagueness in the evidence may be accounted for by the reluctance of certain other testifiers to reveal how they came to have close knowledge of events at Sierra Leone.

<sup>185</sup> Lovell's voyage is poorly recorded before it reached America but there is a faint possibility that he also visited Sierra Leone.

<sup>186</sup> For the use of the term 'Sierra Leone (*Serra Lyoa*)' in this document, particularly in relation to 'the coast of Guinea', see P.E.H. Hair, 'Sierra Leone in the Portuguese Books of Complaint', *Sierra Leone Studies*, 26 (1970), 2–10.

<sup>187</sup> The English undoubtedly sought and obtained slaves at Sierra Leone. But 'slaves, wax, ivory and other goods' may have become a clerical formula, since wax was a common product of River Cacheu but not of Sierra Leone. One important export of the district, particularly from Rivers Scarcies, kola nuts, is not mentioned. (That the English would not have troubled to steal kola, Europeans having no taste for the commodity, does not, presumably, explain the omission.)



Portuguese, native of Santiago Island, carrying many slaves, and much wax and ivory and other goods, the total value of the plunder being 5,000 ducats.

Article 31. At the same time and place he attacked and seized from Francisco d'Alvarenga, a Portuguese, a certain little ship with slaves, ivory, wax and other goods worth a good 4,000 ducats.

Article 32. John Hawkins, with abuse, threats and terror, forced the Portuguese captains and masters (*capitaneos et navarchos*) to make and sign certificates declaring that they had freely sold to the English slaves and other goods which the English, using force, had extorted from the Portuguese. If otherwise any Portuguese refused to do this, they were subjected to immediate threats and terror, not to say blows and torture, so that when they made and signed the certificates the English wanted, this was only because the Portuguese sailors and captains, in their great difficulties and helplessness, were compelled by the English to do it.<sup>188</sup> But the contractors and tax-farmers too were occasioned great loss because the tax-farmers could afford neither the fee to the king as farmers, nor the tax, nor the contract. They seek therefore to produce sworn witnesses to be questioned regarding the correctness of these articles and their testimony to be put on public record, and the document with their testimony to be here considered. Here are the names of those giving testimony. [11 names]<sup>189</sup>

*Unlike the Cacheu evidence, the Articles relating to Sierra Leone are only very thinly backed up by eye-witness testimony, all of the 'witnesses' apparently repeating only hear-say and presumably therefore not actually present. Only one testifier (Lopo Rodrigues) provides detailed evidence in respect of Articles 29–30 and 32, two witnesses (Jorge Valasques, Salvador Fernandes) do not respond to Articles 29–31, a third (Mattheus Fernandes) does not respond to Articles 30–31, while a fourth (Gaspar Fernandes) makes only a very general statement in relation to Articles 29–31 taken together.*

[29] ... attacked and seized a ship from António d'Oliveira ... 5,000 ducats.

[30] ... with his ships and armed men seized a ship of Luís Freire ... 5000 ducats.

[32] ... when they attacked Portuguese ships they paid the Portuguese some money, that is, for one slave only two ducats when a slave was worth fifty gold ducats.<sup>190</sup> And the English sought certificates from the Portuguese for such sales. But if any Portuguese did not agree or refused to produce a certificate declaring that he had freely sold to the English (otherwise known as British) the slaves they wanted, he was immediately subjected to threats and terror, and frightened of punishment was reduced to agreement, with the result that willy-nilly these

<sup>188</sup> The verbiage smacks of protesting too much.

<sup>189</sup> The latter part of this entry refers to all the Articles, and it might be argued that so does the earlier part, and hence that the forced certificates were demanded at various points on the Guinea coast. However, it would seem that only at Sierra Leone were the English in a position to demand them.

<sup>190</sup> It was probably true that in the 1560s a prime slave was worth 50 ducats in Lisbon (on my understanding of the figures in A.C. de C.M. Saunders, *A Social History of Blacks Slaves and Freedmen in Portugal 1441-1555* (Cambridge, 1982), 26-7). But this sum allowed for the transport costs from Guinea, which the argument ignores. That the English paid only two ducats is an even less meaningful statement, since the payment was almost certainly not in cash but in goods. Theoretically at least, the Portuguese could then buy more slaves with the goods. The cost of slaves on the coast in the 1560s is very poorly recorded, partly because the purchase was in goods, but may have been, for a prime slave, between five and ten ducats (Almada, *Tratado Breve*, cap. 14, 71; cap.6, 37; translation chap.6/17, 14/6). A possible conclusion is that the Portuguese were robbed, but robbed much less than they claimed.

Portuguese came to produce the certificates the English wanted. (Lopo Rodrigues)

[29] ... went down the coast and attacked and stole many ships, according to regular and public report ...

[32] ... to produce signed certificates<sup>191</sup> ... for slaves and other goods ... the English gave two ducats to the Portuguese for a slave when each was worth about fifty ducats ... these certificates were to hide thefts, cruelties, killings, abuse, violence, fraud, burnings and other detrimental acts inflicted on the Portuguese. The witness saw many things committed by these robbers on the Portuguese because of their helplessness.<sup>192</sup> ... (Jorge Valasques)

[32] ...to produce certificates ... two ducats or the value of two ducats ... (Salvator Fernandes)

[29–31] ... affirmed on sacred oath that many Portuguese ships were seized, devastated and plundered.

[32] ... to produce signed certificates ... slaves and other goods ... two ducats ... (Gaspar Fernandes)

[29] ... went from River São Domingos down-coast to River Sierra Leone and there robbed many ships, and went on land,<sup>193</sup> and by force robbed many men of their all (*fortuna*). ...

[32] He says that John Hawkins and John Lovell (*Cobel*),<sup>194</sup> both commanders of fleets, by force compelled masters and captains of Portuguese ships ... to produce signed certificates<sup>195</sup> ... (Mattheus Fernandes)

---

<sup>191</sup> Literally, certificates made 'with their own hand'.

<sup>192</sup> The next sentence, as quoted above, refers to River Cacheu, so he is not claiming to be an eye-witness in Sierra Leone.

<sup>193</sup> This is the only reference by a Portuguese testifier to the English going ashore at Sierra Leone.

<sup>194</sup> Articles 18–21 relate to the 1566–1567 voyage of John Lovell, standing in for Hawkins.

<sup>195</sup> Whereas Hawkins had obtained, on previous voyages, from Spanish settlements in the Caribbean, documentation on the sale of slaves, and had used it, partly to encourage later calling points to trade and partly to display to the Spanish authorities when challenged, it is less clear why he obtained documentation from the Portuguese in Guinea. Perhaps it indicates that he hoped to return to the coast, or perhaps he correctly envisaged a Portuguese official protest and his thereby having to answer for his Guinea activities to the English authorities. If Hawkins had obtained 'certificates' when in Guinea on previous voyages, there is no record in either the English or the Portuguese sources of his producing them in the third voyage, which would have been, presumably, in order to demonstrate his non-violent intentions.

---

### A TAILPIECE

... the slave said to him [William Collins] that England must be a good place if there were no slaves there; and he said that it was true, they were all freemen in England; whereupon he responded that John Hawkins had sought slaves and brought them here and how did he account for that? (conversation with Juan Gelofe, a black slave, reported by Collins to the Mexican Inquisition, 1572)<sup>196</sup>

---

<sup>196</sup> AGN Inq. 52 = ADD 7230–1, proceedings against Collins, 1572, 75; Jiménez Rueda, *Corsarios*, 315, 372–3). Juan Gelofe, 'a black from the land of Jolof (*tierra de Gelofe*)', because of his age, stated to be 40, was probably not one of the Cape Verde slaves captured by Hawkins in 1567 (as previously suggested in Hair, 'Protestants', 224). Collins' oblique or deliberately obtuse reply to the question, as reported to the inquisitors, was merely to explain that Hawkins was a heretic, evidencing this at length. It is plausible that the conversation, supposing that it actually took place, was more diffuse than in the form given in the inquisitors' record and that the slave's curiosity involved a comparison of freedom/slavery in England, New Spain and Black Africa. Even so, the passage remains a curious digression in the record and the only instance of a possible reference in all the records to consideration of the moral status of slavery.

## APPENDIX

### RECORDS OF THE ENGLISH CAPTIVES

About 100 prisoners from the Hawkins voyage fell into Spanish hands, all subjects of the English crown (but a handful Welsh or Irish born, and Antony Goddard, alias António de Teixeira/Texada, apparently Portuguese in origin), apart from several Netherlanders and four Frenchmen.<sup>197</sup> After the battle of San Juan de Ulúa, the Spaniards held about 25 prisoners (ten hostages, apparently mainly 'gentlemen', two or three negotiators, including Barrett, and ten fighting men, including four wounded. A further 78 individuals later surrendered at Tampico, including a dozen youths (*muchachos*). The names of most the hostages and negotiators are not recorded, and although the names of the 78 at Tampico are listed, they appear in *la extraña ortografía español* —to quote the Spanish authority on these events — which makes many of the names impossible to identify with certainty in English.<sup>198</sup>

Parties of prisoners were sent to Spain. In 1569 the ten hostages reached Seville, together with 21 others, apparently in the main the leading men among both the San Juan and Tampico prisoners, and including two French prisoners. Some of the 31 died in prison, the names of four being recorded (and six unnamed were said at the time to be dying).<sup>199</sup> But after Fitzwilliam and two others were released in 1570 (and two more may have escaped),<sup>200</sup> in 1571 the remaining survivors of this party were also released (as a result of Hawkins and Fitzwilliam trickily persuading Madrid that in return they would participate in a Catholic uprising against Elizabeth). Not recorded are the names of those in 1571 who were released and who returned to England, perhaps about a dozen.<sup>201</sup> A second party of eight captives, including Barrett, Hortop and five others named by the latter, selected in Mexico seemingly for uppish or heretical misbehaviour, reached Seville in 1570 or 1571.<sup>202</sup> Of these, two were burnt as heretics, the rest sent to the galleys, and as far as we know only Hortop escaped, after many years, and returned to England.

---

<sup>197</sup> Of the some 410 men and boys aboard the fleet when it left England, probably about 300 were still alive when it reached San Juan de Ulúa (Williamson, *Hawkins*, 178). How many died at sea before and after reaching Guinea is unknown, as is the number dying from sickness in Guinea, particularly at Sierra Leone (the later 'Whiteman's Grave'), but probably the total was many score. Those stated to be killed at various point in Guinea numbered 26–27 (8 at Cape Verde, 4 at Cacheu, and 14–15 at Sierra Leone), but the number wounded seems to have been between 50 and 80, of whom no doubt a proportion later succumbed. Total casualties in Guinea, from disease and warfare, may therefore have been 50–70. Thus the fleet left Guinea with probably under 350 of the original 410 aboard. As regards African casualties (apart from those exported as slaves), the number directly killed by the English at Cape Verde, Cacheu and Sierra Leone is unlikely to have been higher than 100. But the number killed in the African civil war at Sierra Leone, including the Anglo-African assault on the town and the subsequent massacre, probably ran into thousands, the killings for the most part, of course, by Africans..

<sup>198</sup> Rumeu de Armas, *Viajes*, 315–6. Names were of course misheard, and some individuals had variant names.

<sup>199</sup> *Calendar of State Papers Foreign, 1569–71*, ed. A.J. Crossley (London, 1874), item 711, letter dated 25.2.1570 = ?1570/1.

<sup>200</sup> Hortop in Hakluyt 1598, 3: 494.

<sup>201</sup> One, however, was Goddard, since Miles Phillips' account described him as alive and living in Plymouth.

<sup>202</sup> The date of the second transfer seems uncertain and may have been instead 1571. One member of the first transfer, William Holland, and one member of the second, Barrett, in 1569 and 1570 had been tried in Mexico for heretical remarks by the episcopal inquisition, and carried this black mark to Spain. Hortop's account does not date the transfer to Spain, but misleadingly states that after the transfer of Goddard, which in fact occurred in 1569, he remained in Mexico for two years (Hakluyt 1598, 3: 492) — if the transfer was in fact in 1570 the actual period must have been nearer one year than two years.

These transfers to Spain left some 60 individuals in Mexico. Released from imprisonment but continuing under a degree of surveillance, in 1572–1574 some 50 were arrested and tried by the Inquisition, the remainder presumably having either died in the interim or escaped being traced. The extant records of the examinations and trials of some 30 show almost all condemned, two being garrotted in 1574 and 1575, and the majority sent to Spain for long service in the galleys, while a few younger men were handed over to monasteries for limited years of re-education. As far as we know, only one of the last group — and indeed the only one of those prisoners retained in Mexico after 1570 — eventually escaped and reached England: this was Phillips. What happened to those sent to the galleys, other than Hortop, is not known, but probably most died before completing their sentence (in 1575 the queen made an inquiry about Collins who was seemingly still surviving).<sup>203</sup> Thus, in the end those sent earlier to Spain did better, on the whole, apart from those who died in Seville prison, than those retained in Mexico, perhaps because of their general higher social standing. All told, some 20 of the 100 captives returned to England, sooner or later.<sup>204</sup>

The records of the examinations and depositions of the English captives survive, with some losses and the increasing decay of individual items, in two archives, in Mexico and Spain: Archivo General de la Nación, Mexico City [hereafter **AGN**], and Archivo General de Indias, Seville [hereafter **AGI**]. Although the captives were first examined by the secular authorities in Mexico, perhaps because some captives were sent to Spain all the Mexican evidence seems to have finished up at Seville, in the form of either the original records or copies. Many of the captives retained in Mexico were later examined there by the Inquisition and much of the material survives in Mexico, although some is lost and the evidence of certain individuals survives only when cited in the records of the trials of others. An incomplete list of those captives whose Inquisition trial records survive, together with a brief summary of the personal details each supplied and his punishment, can be found in G.R.G. Conway, *An Englishman and the Mexican Inquisition 1556–1560* (privately printed, Mexico City, 1927), 155–62. The list below includes, however, only those captives whose evidence is cited in the present edition. The record source for each capture's evidence is given below, following a bold asterisk \*.

Certain of the records have been published, in the following works.

Julio Jiménez Rueda, ed., *Corsarios franceses y ingleses en la Inquisición de la Nueva España, siglo XVI* [hereafter *Corsarios*] (Mexico, 1945), 231–507 [Alexander, Collins; exact references to the call number and pagination not supplied]

Antonio Rumeu de Armas, *Los Viajes de John Hawkins a America (1562–1595)* (Seville, 1947) [hereafter *Viajes*], 445–72 [Green, Stevens, Barrett, Bennett, Sanders]

[G.R.G. Conway, introduction by Julio Jiménez Rueda], ed., 'Proceso contra Miles Philips', *Boletín del Archivo General de la Nación*, 20 (1949), 469–663; 21 (1950), 117–66 [hereafter *BAGN*] [includes evidence

<sup>203</sup> *Calendar of State Papers Spanish 1568–1579*, ed. M.A.S. Hume (London, 1894), 492. Collins, a native of Oxford, by now in the galleys in Spain, is here termed 'Collins of Gravesend'. It is curious that the queen should have troubled about a man who seems a relatively insignificant individual — conceivably Collins had powerful friends at home. It may indicate that Hawkins, after obtaining the release in 1571 of the captives sent to Spain in 1569 and 1570, made some attempt to rescue the captives sent from Mexico to the galleys in 1574.

<sup>204</sup> To complete the count, on the three ships out of the original six which returned to England from the Caribbean, very many of the about 150 Englishmen aboard died en route, in the Atlantic or in Ireland, and probably only about 50 survived — plus, curiously, a few blacks, freemen or slaves. Thus, of the about 410 who left England, only about 70 ever returned.

from other captives]

[English translation] I.A. Wright, *Spanish Documents concerning English Voyages to the Caribbean 1527–1568* (Hakluyt Society, London, 1929), 153–62 [hereafter *Documents*] [Barrett]

### Key to the list below

The opening personal details in each entry indicate **place and date of interrogation**; out-voyage **status** (not always consistently stated); **capture** either at San Juan as a hostage/negotiator = H, or a fighting man = SJ, or else at Tampico by surrender = T, when known; **age** (not always noted) in 1568–9, or otherwise with date; **birthplace** (not always noted); **punishment** in various forms, monastic/number of years, or number of stripes/number of galley years, or burnt; **release** of survivors, often ?dead/?released.

Following a bold star (\*), the **archive sources** are noted in the form they appear in the Conway collection, with ADD introducing the **call number** of the Cambridge series, followed in round brackets by the **section number** given in the published listing, J. Street, 'The G.R.G. Conway Collection in Cambridge University Library: a checklist', *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 37, 1957, 60–81.

The material relating to the voyage when in Guinea is a minor part of the evidence and is normally concentrated near the beginning of a document. The **page/folio numbers** in square brackets indicate only the main Guinea material and represent the page(s)/folio(s) from which the citations in this edition are extracted. The numbers are either those of the original document when these are given in the transcript, but otherwise, those of the translation. They provide only a rough guide to the material on Guinea within the document since some relevant statements may appear later.

See the full version of the first entry below.

### List of Captives Quoted in this Edition

**Armer**, or Reit, Roger, chief armourer *Jesus*; T; 24, Gueldres; 200/6 \* Mexico City 1573–1574 AGN Inq. 149/1 = ADD 7250, 7264 (1); [62–3]

IN FULL: **Armer**, or Reit, Roger, chief armourer on the *Jesus of Lubeck*; captured near Tampico; aged 24, native of Gueldres; condemned to 200 stripes and 6 years in the galleys \* interrogated at Mexico City in 1573–4, documentation in Archivo General de la Nación, Mexico City, call number Inquisición 149/1 = transcript and translation in Cambridge University Library, call number ADD 7250, 7264 (section 1 in Street listing); [main evidence on Guinea 62–3]

**Barrett**, Robert, master of the *Jesus*; H; 25, Saltash/Plymouth; 1569 before episcopal inquisition; 1570 to Spain; tried by the Inquisition, burnt alive Seville 1572 (?) \* (a) Jalapa 8.10.1568, *Viajes*, 454–60 (Guinea, 454–5) = *Documents*, 153–60 (Guinea 154–5) = AGI 2-5-1/20, doc.11 (but Rumeu de Armas gives Patronato Real, leg. 265-11) = ADD 7256 (1), 7257; [30]; (b) Mexico City July–October 1570 AGN Inq. 49/2 = ADD 7229 (3); [58–67]

**Bennett**, Thomas, tailor/gunner *Swallow*; SJ; 1569 to Spain, 1571 ?dead/?released \* San Juan 18.9.1567 [correct 18.10.1567] *Viajes*, 461–7 (Guinea 451–4) = AGI 2-5-1/20, doc.12/2 = ADD 7256 (3), 7257; [5–8]

**Bingham**, Christopher, gentleman adventurer *Jesus*; ?H; 36; 1569 to Spain; before February 1570 (or 1570/1) died Seville \* Seville 1.12.1569 AGI 51-3-81/5 = ADD 7258 (2), 7260 (1); [77–9]

**Bones**, John, sailor *Jesus*; SJ; 1569 to Spain; ? for trying to escape, sent to galleys \* Seville ?11.1569 AGI 51-3-81/5 = ADD 7258 (1), 7260 (1); [27–8]

**Brown**, John, musician; T; 28; 1569 to Spain; 1571 ? burnt alive (according to Miles Phillips, Hakluyt 1589, 572) \* Seville 26.11.1569 AGI 51-3-81/5 = ADD 7258 (2), 7260 (1); [67–75]

**Carvell** or **Varney**, John, gentleman adventurer *Jesus*; H; 23; 1569 to Spain; 1571 ?dead/?released \* Seville 20.11.1569 AGI 51-3-81/5 = ADD 7258 (2), 7260 (1); [57–58v]

**Collins**, William, ? sailor *Jesus*; T; 1574 40, 'university city of Oxford'; 300/10; 1575 inquiry (see above) \* Mexico City 1572–4 *Corsarios*, 307–506 = AGN Inq. 52/4 = ADD 7230–1; [includes evidence on Guinea from Armer, Moon, Tillert, Richard Williams]

**Cornelius**, William, alias Martin, John, sweeper *Jesus*; T; 1574 22, Cork; barber in Mexico; garrotted Mexico City 1575 \* Mexico City 1574–1575 AGN Inq. 58, doc.6 (1927 'water-stained and crumbling to pieces') = ADD 7238–9 [includes evidence on Guinea from Richard Williams]

**Escalart**, Roldan, French sailor in French vessel; SJ; about 25, Normandy; 1573 after trial, released \* Mexico City 1573 AGN Inq. 55 = ADD 7243 (3), 7244 (2); [24–32]

**Fitzwilliam**, George, gentleman adventurer, *Jesus*; ?H; 30; 1569 to Spain; 1570 released \* Seville 2.11.1569 AGI 51-3-81/5 = ADD 7258 (2), 7260 (1); [34–41]

**Fowler**, Thomas, gentleman adventurer, *Jesus*; ?H; 1569 to Spain; 1570 released \* Seville 2.11.1569 AGI 51-3-81/5 = ADD 7258 (2), 7260 (1); [4–14]

**Goddard**, Anthony, alias Antonio de Texada/Texera, soldier *Jesus*; T; ? Azores, 1570 24; 1569 to Spain; 1571 released; 1582 living at Plymouth (Hakluyt 1589, 567) \* (a) Tampico 18.10.1568 AGI 2-5-1/20, doc.12/4 = ADD 7256 (5), 7257; [4–5]; (b) Seville 2.11.1569 AGI 51-3-81/5 = ADD 7258 (2), 7260 (1) [4–14]

**Goodall** alias Vidal, Thomas, tailor/soldier *Jesus*, then French vessel; T; about 30, London; 300/10 \* Mexico City 1573–1574 AGN Inq. 57/3 = ADD 7242 (1), 7243 (1); [28]

**Green** ['Ber' = 'Verde', or ? **Beer/Bird/Baird**], Valentine, trader *Jesus*; 24; London; SJ; 1569 to Spain; 1571 ?dead/?released; \* (a) Vera Cruz 5.10.1568, *Viajes*, 446–50 (Guinea, 446–7) = AGI 2-5-1/20, doc.11 = ADD 7256 (1), 7257; [2–3]; (b) Seville 3.11.1569 = AGI 51-3-81/5 = ADD 7258 (2), 7260 (1); [3–6]

**Hall**, John, cooper *Jesus*; SJ; 50; 1569 to Spain; 1571 ?dead/?released \* Vera Cruz 8.10.1568 AGI 2-5-1/20, no.11 = ADD 7256 (1), 7257; [21–3]

**Hen**, James, sailor *Jesus*; T; 40; 1569 to Spain; 1571 ?dead/?released \* Seville 7.12.1569 AGI 51-3-81/5 [123–4]

**Holland**, John, ship's boy *Minion*; ?T; 22; 1569 to Spain; 1571 ?dead/?released \* Seville 9.12.1569 AGI 51-3-81/5 = ADD 7258 (2), 7260 (1); [102v–105]

**Holland**, William, gentleman adventurer *Minion*; H; 19, London; 1569 before episcopal inquisition; 1569 to Spain, before February 1570 (or 1570/1) died Seville \* (a) Mexico City 23.2.1569 AGN Inq. 9/6 = ADD 7229 (1,2); [3–6]; (b) Seville 24.11.1569 AGI 51-3-81/5 = ADD 7258 (2), 7260 (1); [12–13]

**Hortop**, Job, gunner *Jesus*; T; 20, Redriffe; 1570 to Spain, sentenced to galleys; 1590 returned to England \* no extant archive file

**Jones**, Walter, armourer *Jesus*; SJ; 34; 1569 to Spain; 1571 ?dead/?released \* Seville 7.12.1569 AGI 51-3-81/5 = ADD 7258 (2), 7260 (1); [84–5]

**Jones**, Thomas, bugler *Jesus*; T; 30; 1569 to Spain; 1571 ?dead/?released \* Seville 7.12.1569 AGI 51-3-81/5 [84–5]

**Moon**, John, sailor *Jesus*; T; 26, Looe; 200/6 \* Mexico City 1573–1574 AGN Inq. 55/4 = ADD 7248 (1), 7249 (1); [49]

**Morris**, Henry, ship's boy/page *Jesus*; SJ; 19; 1569 to Spain; 1571 ?dead/?released \* San Juan 18.9.1568 [18.10.1568] AGI 2-5-1/20, no.12/2 = ADD 7256 (3), 7257; [97v–100v]

**Phillips**, Miles, page to Hawkins *Jesus*; T; 1568 15, 1572 18, London; 1574 monastic/3; escaped to England February 1582 (or 1582/3) \* Mexico City 1573–1574 *BAGN* = AGN Inq. 54/2 (1927 'in very bad condition and crumbling to pieces', 1950 'now almost totally destroyed by insect activity', 1967 'no longer extant') = ADD 7240–1

**Quince**, Henry/Stephen, gunner *Minion*; ?T; 34; 1569 to Spain; ? before February 1570, died Seville \* Seville 6.12.1569 AGI 51-3-81/5 = ADD 7258 (2), 7260 (1); [109–10]

**Reaveley**, George, sailor *Jesus*; T; about 30, Gravesend; 1574 tried and garrotted \* Mexico City 1573–1574 AGN Inq. 54 and 54/5 = ADD 7232 (1,2), 7233; [180]

**Reed**, Richard, cooper *Jesus*; SJ; 24; 1569 to Spain; 1571 ?dead/?released \* Vera Cruz 18.9.1568 [18.10.1568] AGI 2-5-1/20, no.11 = ADD 7256 (1), 7257; [16–17]

**Robinson**, Christopher, gunner *Minion*; ?T; 30; 1569 to Spain; 1571 ?dead/?released \* Seville 23.11.1569 AGI 51-3-81/5 = ADD 7258 (2), 7260 (1); [27v–29]

**Sanders**, William, boatswain/soldier; SJ; 34; 1572 ?dead/?untraced in Mexico \* San Juan 19.10.1568 *Viajes*, 467–72 (Guinea, 468–9) = AGI 2-5-1/20, doc.12/2 = ADD 7256 (3), 7257; [19–22]

**Sargeant**, Noah, sailor *Jesus*, then the 'carvel'; ?T; 30; 1569 to Spain; 1571 ?dead/?released \* (a) San Juan 18.10.1568 AGI 2-5-1/20, no.12/2 = ADD 7256 (3), 7257; [29–34]; (b) Seville 23.11.1569 AGI 51-3-81/5 = ADD 7258 (2), 7260 (1); [38–39v]

**Simmons/Simon**, Gregory, musician *Jesus*; ?T; 19–20; 1569 to Spain; 1571 ?burnt alive (according to Miles Phillips, Hakluyt 1589, 572) \* Seville 24.11.1569 AGI 51-3-81/5 = ADD 7258 (2), 7260 (1); [48–50v]

**Sole**, Michael, gentleman adventurer ?*Jesus*; 20; SJ; 1569 to Spain; 1571 ?dead/?released \* (a) Vera Cruz 6.10.1568 = AGI 2-5-1/20, doc.11 = ADD 7256 (1), 7257; [11–12]; (b) Seville 26.11.1569 = AGI 51-3-81/5 = ADD 7258 (2), 7260 (1); [20–1]

**Stevens**, Gregory, trader *Jesus*; SJ; 1570 20, Plymouth; 1569 to Spain; 1571 ?dead/?released \* Vera Cruz 6.10.1568 *Viajes*, 450–4 (Guinea 450) = AGI 2-5-1/20, doc.11 = ADD 7256 (1), 7257; [6–7]

**Stevens**, Thomas, gunner *Jesus*; SJ; 1568 28, 1570 29; 1569 to Spain; 1571 ?dead/?released \* (a) Vera Cruz 8.10.1568 AGI 2-5-1/20, doc.11 = ADD 7256–7 (1); [25–6]; (b) Seville 6.12.1569 = AGI 51-3-81/5 = ADD 7258 (2), 7260 (1); [94–5]

**Temple**, Richard, gentleman adventurer *Jesus*; SJ; 1569 to Spain; before February 1570 (or 1570/1) died Seville \* Seville 28.11.1569 AGI 51-3-81/5 = ADD 7256 (2), 7258; [45–7]

**Tillert**, Morgan, or, Morgan, Michael, sailor *Jesus*; T; about 40, St Bridgets/Cardiff; 200/8 \* Mexico City 1572–1574 ADD 7234–5 (original in private possession in 1927, see Conway 1927, 161)

**Treshan** or Truslan, John, sailor *Jesus*; SJ; 1568 28, 1570 30; 1569 to Spain; 1571 ?dead/?released \* Seville 6.12.1569 AGI 51-3-81/5 = ADD 7258 (2), 7260 (1); [73–4]

**Williams**, Richard, page to master of *Jesus*; T; 1568 about 20, 1572 19, Bristol; monastic/5 \* Mexico City 1573–1574 AGN Inq. 56/54 = ADD 7264 (2) [no translation listed]



# INDEX

The index refers mainly to the text, but includes occasional items in the footnotes, where the particular item is not referred to on the same page of the text. Items in footnotes are listed below by the note number in italics, preceded by *n*. Only exceptionally variant spellings are listed.

## PEOPLES

The terms 'English', 'Portuguese', 'Africans', 'Negroes' and 'Blacks' are not listed.

Baga, 61  
 Berbers, 21, *n41*  
 Bullom, 61, 72  
 Calus, *n135*  
 French, 7–9, 21–23, 26, 27, 30, 32–35, 41, 69, 83, 86; as pirates, 32–34  
 Irish, 83  
 Jolof/Wolof, 25, 26, *n51*, *n63*  
 Lebu, *n51*  
 Leophares, 25  
 Manding, *n141*  
 Mane, 61, 66, 69, 72  
 Manicongo, 25  
 Moors, 19  
 Netherlanders, 83  
 Sapes, 61, 69  
 Spaniards/Spanish, 1, 2, 4–11, 15–18, 21, 30–33, 36, 41–43, 69, 73, 77, 83, 85  
 Sumba, 60, 61  
 Vai, *n141*  
 Welsh, 83

## PERSONS

### English, Welsh, and Irish individuals

Armer, alis Beit, Roger, 34, 85  
 Barrett, Robert, 16, 17, 22, 30, 33, 36, 39, 41, 42, 52, 62, 70, 71, 73, 75, 76, 83–85  
 Bennett, Thomas, 22, 23, 72, 74, 76, 84, 85  
 Bingham, Christopher, 23, 42, 62, 85  
 Bolton, Thomas, 13  
 Bones, John, 23, 85  
 Brown, John, 23, 74, 86  
 Carvell, alias Varney, John, 20, 30, 86  
 Collins, William, 24, 34, 43, 71, 82, 84, 86  
 Conway, G.R.G., 4, 5, 11, 84, 85, 87  
 Cornelius, William, alias Martin, John, 16, 86  
 Drake, Francis, 13, 32, 33, 35, 39  
 Dudley, [Edward], 29, 39  
 Eden, Richard, 5  
 Elizabeth, queen, 6, 12, 83  
 Fenner, George, 26, 27, 28  
 Field, captain, 58  
 Fitzwilliam, George, 23, 83, 86, *n9*  
 Fowler, Thomas, 42, 62, 86

Garret, John, 13  
 Goddard, Anthony, 23, 35, 70, 83, 86  
 Goodall, , alias Vidal, Thomas, 35, 86  
 Green, Valentine, 22, 23, 30, 33, 36, 84, 86  
 Hakluyt, Richard, 2, 3, 9, 11, 12, 19, 20, 26, 38, 39, 57, 58, 65, 66, 85–87  
 Hall, John, 42, 76, 86  
 Hampton, John, 13, *n19*  
**Hawkins, John**, *passim*  
     and gold voyages, 9, 17; and military action, 7; and the Spanish crown, 7; at prayer, 15; attack on Portuguese, 6, 7; his 1562–1563 voyage, 55; his 1564–1565 voyage, 19, 20, 25–6, 55, 57, 65; personality, 7; summary of his 1567–1569 voyage, 17; trading in America, 6  
 Hen, James, 16, 86  
 Holland, John, 74  
 Holland, William, 23, 34, 42, 70, 86  
 Hortop, Job, 3, 11, 12, 14, 20, 28, 29, 32, 33, 36, 38, 39, 52, 55–58, 61, 62, 67–70, 73, 74, 77, 83, 84, 86  
 Ingram, David, *n6*, *n8*  
 Jones, Thomas, 16  
 Jones, Walter, 16  
 Lee, Frances, 14  
 Lovell, John, 9, 27, 28, 79, 80; his 1566–1567 voyage, 57  
 Moon, John, 85, 86  
 Morris, Henry, 31, 86  
 Phillips, Miles, 2, 11–13, 19, 28, 36, 38, 43, 55, 66–68, 70, 73, 74, 77, 84, 85, 87  
 Queen [Mary] of England, 8  
 Quince, Henry/Stephen, 74, 87  
 Quinn, D.B., *n15*  
 Raunce, James, 13  
 Reaveley, George, 43, 87  
 Reed, Richard, 36, 78, 87  
 Robinson, Christopher, 23, 42, 87  
 Sanders, William, 16, 23, 30, 34, 36, 42, 84, 87  
 Sargeant, Noah, 34, 36, 42, 62, 75, 87  
 Simmons, Gregory, 72, 74, 87  
 Sole, Michael, 16, 17, 23, 30, 33, 42, 62, 74, 76, 87  
 Spark, John, 9, 19, 25, 31, 9, *n41*  
 Stevens, Gregory, 18, 30, 33, 76, 84, 87  
 Temple, Richard, 16, 23, 30, 34, 62, 71, 72, 87  
 Tillert, Morgan, 85, 87

Tomson, Robert, *n*13  
 Treshan, John, 76, 87  
 Williams, Richard, 71, 85  
 Williamson, J.A., 1, 4, 5, 12, 21, 27, 28, 32,  
 36, 38

#### Portuguese individuals

Álvaro Cardoso, 50, 51  
 Álvaro Gonçalves, 47, 48, 50  
 Álvaro Lopes, 44  
 Álvaro Pires, 44, 48, 52  
 António de Brito, 51  
 António d'Oliveira, 79  
 António Gonçalves, 50  
 Bertolomeu Bayão, 69  
 Blàs Daveiga Albernaz, 48, 52  
 Duarte Leão, 50  
 Enrique Nuñez, 18  
 Fernando Gonçalves, 47, 50, 51  
 Fernando Gonçalves Barrasa, 51  
 Fernando Pires, 45, 52  
 Francisco d'Alvarenga, 79  
 Francisco de Pardo, 45  
 Garçia Fernandes, 48  
 Gaspar d'Araujo, 45  
 Gaspar Fernandes, 51–53, 80  
 João Dias, 44  
 Jorge Valasques, 49, 51, 53, 78, 80  
 King of Portugal, 23, 39, 41, 50, 51, 53, 78  
 Lopo Rodrigues, 51, 53, 79, 80  
 Luís Freire, 79, 80  
 Manuel de Verga/Davega, 48, 49, 51  
 Manuel Pires, 48  
 Martin Lopes, 48  
 Matheus Fernandes, 51, 53, 80, 81  
 Maya, –, 22, 23  
 Rodrigo de Sousa, 52  
 Salvador Fernandes, 51, 53

#### African and other individuals

Bland, captain, 32, 33 — see also Planes  
 Cadamosto, 31  
 Escalart, Roldan, 35, 85  
 Farma Xere, king, 72, 73  
 Gelofe, Juan, 82, *n*43  
 Pedro da Ponte, 18, 33, 34  
 Pedro de Trejo, *n*49  
 Philip of Spain, 7  
 Planes, Jean, 33–35 — see also Bland  
 Ribeiro, Miguel, 70, 78  
 Rumeu de Armas, Antonio, 18, 84, 85  
 Sacena/Zacina, 69, 70, 72, 77  
 Setecama/Zetecama, 72, 76  
 Sheri, king, 73, 76  
 Sheri Bangi, 76  
 Tora, king, 72

Yhoma, king, 72  
 Zambulo, 59, 60, 61

#### PLACES

The terms 'England', 'Portugal', 'Guinea' and 'Africa' are not listed.

America/American, 1, 5–9, 13, 18, 41, 84  
 Arguim, 41, 43, 46  
 Azores, 86  
 Baie de Lévrier, *n*42  
 Bissagos Islands, 38, 55  
 Bissau, *n*80  
 Bristol, *n*87  
 Buguendo, 39, 42, 50, 79  
 Bullom Shore, *n*144  
 Bymba, 57, 58, 61  
 Cabano Island, 72  
 Caces/Casseroes/Causserus/Castros, River,  
 55–57, 62, 72, 76 — see also Scarcies  
 Cacheu, River, 6, 9, 29, 36–39, 41, 43, 44,  
 49, 53, 65, 78 — see also São Domingos  
 Cacheu town, attack on, 9, 39, 40, 52, 53  
 Callowsa/Calowses, River, 55, 57, 59, 60  
 Canary Islands, 6, 9, 18, 34; attitude to  
 foreign trade, 6; Spanish authorities in, 18,  
 20  
 Cap Blanc, 8, 9, 19, 21–23, 33, 42  
 Cape Mount, 72  
 Cape Roxo, 9, 36–39, 41, 47, 48  
 Cape Verde, 9, 21, 22, 25–28, 30–34  
 Cape Verde Islands, 26, 27, 41, 44, *n*184 —  
 see also Santiago  
 Cardiff, 87  
 Caribbean, 6, 10, 21, 52, 67, 77, 85  
 Casamance, River, 36  
 Conga, town 72, *n*160  
 Dakar, *n*54  
 Dembia, River, *n*135  
 Dubréka, River, *n*135  
 Fez, 23  
 Forécária, River, *n*135  
 France, 7  
 Gambia, River, 36  
 Gold Coast, 9, 17  
 Gomera, island, 13, 14, 18–20  
 Gravesend, 87  
 Gueldres, 85  
 Harfleur, 33, 34  
 Idolos, 62, 70 — see also Iles de Los  
 Iles de Los, 10, 38, 55, 56, 61, 62, 65 — see  
 also Idolos  
 Ilha Formosa, 55  
 Indies, 14, 27, 64, 68

Jalapa, 85  
 Jeba, River, 38  
 Kalum Peninsula, 61  
 Kassa Island, 55  
 Kru Bay, 65  
 Lisbon, 6, 44, 45, 48, 49, 51, 53, 78  
 London, 11, 12, 14, 21, 85–87  
 Looe, 86  
 Magrabomba, 60, 62, 65, 72  
 Malagueta Coast, 9  
 Mellakuri, River, *n135*  
 Mexico/Mexican, 1–5, 8, 11, 12, 16, 38, 70, 71, 77, 82–87  
 Mina, 7, 9  
 Mitombi/Mytombo, 70, 71, 78, *n104*  
 Morocco, 21, *n41*  
 New Spain, 15, 16  
 Normandy, 86  
 Oxford, 86  
 Plymouth, 11, 13, 15, 65–87  
 Pongas/Pongo, River, 55, 57  
 Port Loko Creek, *n170*  
 Rio das Pedras, 55  
 Rio Grande, 36, 38, 41, 42, 52, 55, 68  
 Rochelle, 32  
 Sahara, 9, 19, 21, *n41*  
 Sambula, island, 55, 60, 61  
 Sangaréa Bay, *n135*  
 San Juan de Ulúa, 1, 2, 10, 24, 43, 83, 85–87  
 Santiago, island, 48, 50, 79, 57 — see also  
     Cape Verde Islands  
 São Domingos, River, 38, 42, 45, 48–50, 53, 80 — see also River Cacheu  
 Scarcies, River, 57, 62, 63, 72, 77 — see also  
     Caces  
 Senegal, 9, 27, 33  
 Senegambia, 31, *n51*  
 Seville, 83–87  
 Sherbro Island, 62  
 Sierra Leone, 10, 29, 36, 37, 44, 48, 49, 52, 55–57, 60–63, 65, 66, 68–72, 75–80, *n14*, *n57*  
 Spanish America, 1, 6, 7; attitude of settlers, 6  
 Spain, 2, 4–7, 9, 15, 16, 41, 83–87  
 Tabunsu River, *n143*  
 Tagrin, 59, 60, 62, 68  
 Tamara, island, 55  
 Tampico, 83, 85, 86  
 Teneriffe, 14, 18, 20  
 Terceira Island, 45  
 Tombo Island, *n143*  
 Vera Cruz, 86–87  
 Viana, 20, 22

## SELECT SUBJECTS

Adultery, 59  
 Ambergris, *n56*  
 Anthropophagy, 61 — see also Cannibalism  
 Anti-Catholic, 4; actions, 24, 43  
 Arrows, 19, 25, 26, 28–31, 40, 56, 74, 75  
 Attacks on African settlements, 7, 9, 10, 25, 26, 28–31, 39–42, 52–54, 57, 58, 64, 66, 67, 73–77  
 Book of complaints, 4, 27, 55, 63, 77; how prepared, 44, 45  
 Cacheo episode, suppression of, 38  
 Cannibalism, 59–61, 73 — see also  
     Anthropophagy  
 Captives, English, 4, 5, 8, 12, 16, 18, 19, 21, 30, 32, 36, 38, 42, 62, 68, 72, 73, 84  
 Catholic, 16, 83  
 Certificates of voluntary sale, 7, 22, 34, 78–81  
 Co-existence, opportunist, 6, 65  
 Contract/contractors, 44, 45, 47–51, 53, 79  
 Cotton MS, 1, 3, 5, 12, 14, 18–21, 29, 32, 33, 36–39, 42, 51, 53, 58, 60–62, 65, 68–70, 72, 73, 77  
 Crocodile, 58, 61  
 Deaths on the voyage, 25, 28–30, 56, 60, 71  
 Elephant, 39, 68  
 Fire works, 75  
 Fish/fishing/fishermen, 9, 11, 19, 20, 23, 42, 55  
 Gold, 9, 17, 23, 58, 64, 74, 80, 56  
 Gold trade/voyages, 6, 7, 9  
 Gum, 27, 56  
 Hakluyt Society, 12, 85, *n4*  
 Heretics, 4, 6, 43, 83, 84  
 Hides, 26, 27, 32, 34, 56  
 Hippopotamus, 61 — see also Sea horse, Horse  
 Horse, [sea], 60 — see also Sea horse, Hippopotamus  
 Imprest, 16  
 Inquisition, 4, 16, 42, 43, 69, 70, 71, 82, 84, 85  
 International law, 5, 6  
 Interpreters, Africans in England as, 10, 16, 19  
 Islam, 8  
 Ivory, 26, 27, 47, 50, 76, 79, 56  
 Kola, *n181*  
 Law of the sea, 20–22  
 Lutherite, 43  
 Musk, 26, 39, 56  
 Occupation, effective, 9  
 Oysters, 67  
 Palamita, 67  
 Pirate, 5, 7, 21, 30, 33, 34, 45, 47, 49, 50  
 Plantain, 67

Poison, 28, 31  
 Portuguese in Guinea, trading with foreigners, 6–8  
 Portuguese naval action against foreigners, 7  
 Portuguese, torture of, 43  
 Protestant, *n13*  
 Raiding, 7, 8, 25, 28, 31, 36 – see also Slave  
 Religion, 35, 70, 71, 25  
 Renegade, 9, 69  
 Sea horse, 56 — see also Horse, Hippopotamus  
 Shark, 55  
 Slave/slaving/slave trade, 5–10, 14–17, 23–28, 31, 41, 43–45, 47, 49, 50, 55–58, 62, 63, 65, 69–71, 77–80, 82; conditions in Middle Passage, 8 — see also Raiding  
 Soldier, 7, 16, 23, 30, 32, 34–36, 42, 43, 53, 59, 73, 74, 76, 86, 87, *n15*  
 Traders, African, 26, 31  
 Wax, 49, 50, 78, 79  
 Whiteman's Grave, The, 71

## SHIPS

*Angel*, 13, 20, 38, 56, 67  
*Grace of God*, *n69*  
*Holy Ghost*, 34  
*Jesus [of Lubeck]*, 11, 13–15, 20, 22, 39, 41, 73, 76, 85–87  
*Judith*, 13, 15, 20, 38, 56, 57, 67  
*Minion*, 11, 13, 15, 18, 76, 86, 87  
*Nossa Senhora d'Aguia*, 45  
*S. Nicolau*, 48, 49  
*Salomon*, 58  
*Swallow*, 13, 14, 15, 18, 20, 27, 28, 39, 65, 76, 85  
*William and John*, 13–15, 18, 20, 39, 41, 57, 66

# Leipziger Arbeiten zur Geschichte & Kultur in Afrika

- No. 1: Leipziger Missionare und kolonialer Alltag auf dem 'Missionsfeld' am Kilimanjaro**  
Steffen Lehmann, 2003. ISBN 3-935999-15-1. Pp. 64
- No. 2: Die Maasai, Chagga und Pare auf historischen Fotografien der Sammlung des Museums für Völkerkunde zu Leipzig**  
Viola Solluntsch, 2003. ISBN 3-935999-19-4. Pp. 136, 116
- No. 3: Berichte einer Exkursion nach Süd-Ghana**  
Adam Jones & Anne-Sophie Arnold (Hrsg.), 2003. ISBN 3-935999-18-6. Pp. 88
- No. 4: Die Buchkrise im anglophonen Afrika seit Mitte der 1980er Jahre. Ein 3-Länder-Vergleich**  
Maja Machmutow, 2003. ISBN 3-935999-23-2. Pp. 113
- No. 5: Einflüsse auf die Musik Süd-Ghanas bis 1966**  
Matthias Eger, 2004. ISBN 3-935999-27-5. Pp. 82
- No. 6: Die Leiter des Todes. Bestattungen in Süd-Ghana seit Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts**  
Christoph Langer, 2004. ISBN 3-935999-34-8. Pp. 76
- No. 7: La question foncière à Aného (Togo) pendant la période allemande (1888-1913)**  
Françoise Caupeil, 2004. ISBN 3-935999-33-X. Pp. 156
- No. 8: Afrika bis 1990 in den Archiven der Neuen Bundesländer. Eine erste Bestandsaufnahme**  
Birgit Niquice, 2004. ISBN 3-935999-35-6. Pp. 239
- No. 9: Die Wahrnehmung und Herausbildung von Ethnizität in Deutsch-Ostafrika**  
Manuela Büttner, 2005. ISBN 3-935999-39-9. Pp. 104
- No. 10: Das Bild des "Afrikaners" im Spiegel deutscher Zeitschriften der Aufklärung**  
Jana Braun, 2005. ISBN 3-935999-50-X. Pp. 91
- No. 11: Die Felsmalereien und –gravierungen des südlichen Afrika. Eine vergleichende Analyse**  
Christina Otto, 2006. ISBN 3-935999-51-8. Pp. 138
- No. 12: Die Leipziger Baumwoll- und Sisalplantagen in Deutsch-Ostafrika**  
Kathrin Fritsch, 2007. ISBN 3-935999-59-3. Pp. 52 (50 ill.)
- No. 13: Deutsches Missionare und afrikanische Initiationsriten in Südafrika vor 1939**  
Silke Isaak, 2008. ISBN 3-935999-64-X. Pp. 41
- No. 14: Geschichtskultur in Südost-Togo**  
Tina Kramer, 2008. ISBN 3-935999-65-8. Pp. 147
- No. 15: Der schöne Körper: Afrikanische Weiblichkeitskonzepte**  
Margit Lehr, 2011. ISBN 3-935999-71-2. Pp. vi, 86
- No. 16: Zwischen Moral und Selbsthilfe: Die Relevanz lokaler Institutionen zur Bewältigung von HIV/AIDS im Südwesten Tansanias**  
Susann Küster, 2011. ISBN 3-935999-72-0. Pp. 136, xviii
- No. 17: Raumwissenstransfer in Westafrika im 19. Jahrhundert. Eine Untersuchung am Beispiel der Reisewerke von Raffeneil und Gallieni**  
Ulrike Luttenberger, 2011. ISBN 3-935999-74-7
- No. 18: Oyster Bay - eine koloniale Heterotopie und ihre postkoloniale Bedeutung**  
Jochen Lingelbach, 2011. ISBN 3-935999-75-5. Pp. 120

# History and Culture Series

**No. 1: Journal of a Missionary Tour to the Labaya Country (Guinea / Conakry) in 1850, by Rev. John Ulrich Graf, Church Missionary Society**

Edited by Bruce Mouser, 1998. ISBN 3-932632-20-6. Pp. vi, 52

An edited transcription of the journal of a missionary based in Sierra Leone, who in 1850 visited part of what is today Guinea-Conakry, inhabited by Susu people.

**No. 2: Travels into the Baga and Soosoo Countries in 1821. By Peter McLachlan**

Edited by Bruce L. Mouser & Ramon Sarro, with a bibliography of the Baga by Ramon Sarro, 1999. ISBN 3-932632-42-7. Pp. x, 55

A new edition of one of the first monographs published in tropical Africa (in 1821) and the first systematic attempt to describe the Baga and Susu.

**No. 3: Africa in Leipzig: A City Looks at a Continent, 1730-1950**

Edited by Adam Jones, 2000. ISBN 3-932632-63-X. Pp. viii, 48

Short essays on how an African "presence" was felt in Leipzig, e.g. through the collection of "curiosities", ethnographic artefacts and travellers' records, the publication of books, missionary work, teaching and research at the university and the public display of Africans.

**Nos. 4 and 9: Zachary Macaulay and the Development of the Sierra Leone Company, 1793-4.**

**Part 1: Journal, June-Oct. 1793. Part 2: Journal, October-December 1793**

Edited by Suzanne Schwarz, 2000, 2002. ISBN 3-932632-64-8, 3-935999-04-6. Pp. xxii, 72, xxvii, 35

Macaulay (1768-1838) arrived in Sierra Leone in 1792 as one of two members of council appointed to assist the governor of the Sierra Leone Company's new colony for free blacks.

**No. 5: Hawkins in Guinea 1567-1568**

Edited by P. E. H. Hair, 2000. ISBN 3-932632-65-6. Pp. 92

John Hawkins' third slaving voyage to West Africa was the most ambitious and, partly because it ended in disaster, the best recorded. This edition analyses the Guinea section of the voyage by drawing on English, Portuguese and Spanish sources.

**No. 6: Account of the Mandingoes, Susoos, & Other Nation[s], c. 1815. By Rev. Leopold Butscher**

Edited by Bruce L. Mouser, 2000. ISBN 3-932632-72-9. Pp. x, 39

The first systematic ethnographic survey of the "Rivières du Sud" of coastal Guinea-Conakry, describing the "Mandingo", Susu, Baga, Nalu, and Landuma peoples. Butscher's manuscript has been annotated and supplemented with the text of an anonymous study of the Mandingo.

**No. 7: Afrika in der europäischen Fiktion 1689-1856: Zwei Studien**

Ralf Hermann & Silke Strickrodt, 2001. ISBN 3-932632-84-2. Pp. iii, 23

Two papers on how Africa was depicted in early fictional works. One discusses four German prose works from the 17th and 18th centuries, indicating how they were influenced by literary fashions and philosophical debates. The other deals with a British woman who visited West Africa in the early nineteenth century.

**No. 8: Histoire d'Agoué (République du Bénin) par le Révérend Père Isidore Pélofy**

Régina Byll-Cataria, 2002. ISBN 3-935999-03-8. Pp. 39

Notebooks kept by a Catholic missionary during his residence on the coast of what is now Bénin. Pélofy's notes cover the period between the founding of Agoué in 1821 and the introduction of French colonial rule in the 1880s. This edition sheds light on the origins of families originating from Brazil, Cuba and Sierra Leone.

**No. 10: Jan Czekanowski - African Ethnographer & Physical Anthropologist in Early Twentieth-Century Germany and Poland**

Adam Jones (ed.), 2002. ISBN 3-935999-09-7. Pp. 103

9 papers on Czekanowski (1882-1965), the ethnographer in the expedition of Adolf Friedrich, Duke of Mecklenburg, to East Central Africa in 1907-8. In what are today Rwanda, western Uganda and eastern Democratic Republic of Congo he collected artefacts and skulls, ethnographic and other information, as well as recording music and speech. Later he became a specialist in the physical anthropology of Central Europe.

**No. 11: Arno Krause: Tagebuch der Missionsstation Nkoaranga (Tanzania) 1902-1905**

Klaus-Peter Kiesel (Hg.), 2004. ISBN 3-935999-30-5. Pp. 198 (44 ill.)

Transcription of a diary kept by the first Lutheran missionary on Mount Meru (northern Tanzania).

**Nos. 12-13 & 15: Kindheit und Bekehrung in Nord-Tansania: Aufsätze von Afrikanern aus dem ehemaligen Deutsch-Ostafrika (Tanzania) vom Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts**

Klaus-Peter Kiesel (Hg.), Vol. 1: 2005. ISBN 3-935999-41-0. Pp. 210 (31 ill.). Vol. 2: 2007. ISBN 3-935999-58-5. Pp. 161 (50 ill.). Vol. 3: 2013. ISBN 3-935999-78-X. Pp. 211 (66 ill.)

Essays by pupils of the Leipzig Mission's teachers' seminary in Marangu (northern Tanzania), 1912-1916, in Swahili and in German translation, on "My Childhood" and "How I Was Converted".

**No. 14: Geschichte der Afrikanistik in Leipzig**

Felix Brahm (Hg.), 2011. ISBN 3-935999-73-9. Pp. 115

Essays on the history of African Studies at the University of Leipzig from the 1890s to the 1990s.